

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XVII. No. 18 }
WHOLE No. 434 }

AUGUST 11, 1917

{ \$3.00 A YEAR
PRICE, 10 CENTS }

Chronicle

The War.—On July 31 the Allies, after a long preparation of intense artillery fire made an attack on a front of about twenty miles in Flanders, and pushed forward from Dixmude to the Lens River, south of Warneton. The amount of territory, thus gained, varied at different points of the line, but the Germans were driven back for a distance of two miles on a front of about twelve miles. Twelve towns and villages were taken, one of which, St. Julien, was later retaken by the Germans, and still later recaptured by the British. Further gains had been made by the Canadians east of Lens.

Bulletin, July 30, p.m.
Aug. 6, a.m.

The occupation of Eastern Galicia by the Austro-Germans is practically complete, the only portion now remaining in the hands of the Russians being a narrow

*Collapse of the
Russians*

strip East of Brody. North of the Dniester the Russians, who are in a state of demoralization, have refused to recognize the authority of their officers, and have made no serious effort to defend their positions. They have abandoned Tarnopol, Skala, Husiatyn, and have been driven across the Zbrocz River into Russian territory. South of the Dniester, a greater degree of military discipline has been maintained, but the retirement of the Russian army north of the river has necessitated the evacuation of Horodenka, Sniatyn and Kutyl. In Bukovina also the Austro-Germans have been sweeping forward, and have occupied Czernowitz and the sector northeast of it as far as the Russian frontier, which they have crossed in the direction of Chotin. Further south they have taken Raranoze, Bojan, Radautz, Kimpolung and Watra. In Rumania the combined Russian and Rumanian forces have driven back the Austro-Germans about eleven miles on a front of forty miles.

On August 2 the Food Control bill and the Food Survey bill, the latter after a delay of two months, were reported out of conference in practically the same form

The Food Bills

as that given them by the Administration. There was some disposition, even among the Senate conferees, to eliminate the Committee on War Expenditures, as it was generally believed that the President would no longer insist that Mr. Hoover should be the sole food

administrator if the war expenditures committee were eliminated from the bill. Mr. Wilson, however, made it clear that he would oppose the committee on food control, and in deference to his wishes both of the Senate's amendments, together with the labor exemption clause, were dropped. The House passed the bill as reported without serious protest; but the Senate regards it with a good deal of disfavor. It will come up for vote early during the week, but whether it will pass or not is by no means certain at the present writing, because there is a strong movement to send it back to conference.

*Proposed Prohibition
Amendment*

The Sheppard resolution, submitting to the States a prohibition amendment to the Federal Constitution, passed the Senate on July 31 by a vote of 65 to 20. It reads as follows:

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Resolved by the Senate and House in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each house concurring therein) that the following amendment to the Constitution be and hereby is proposed to the States, to become valid as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of the several States as provided by the Constitution:

Section 1. The manufacture, sale or transportation of intoxicating liquors within, the importation thereof into, or the exportation thereof from the United States and all territories subject to the jurisdiction thereof for beverage purposes is hereby prohibited.

Section 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the Legislatures of the several States as provided in the Constitution within six years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress.

Section 3. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

There is little likelihood of the measure being introduced into the House before the end of the year, as the Democratic leaders have stated that that body would refuse to consider any legislation during the present extraordinary session, except that bearing on the conduct of the war. Unless therefore the President insists on the passage of the resolution, it will not in all probability be taken up in the House until Congress reconvenes in December.

The first important step toward requisitioning all the shipping resources of the United States was taken by the Shipping Board on August 4, when Admiral Capps, the general manager of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, notified shipyards throughout the country that all ships and all materials and equipment for the same in the yards under their control had been commandeered by the Government. The notice read:

**Ships
Requisitioned**

By virtue of an act of Congress, approved June 15, 1917, entitled "An Act Making Appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments on Account of War Expenses for the Fiscal Year Ending June Thirteenth, Nineteen Hundred and Seventeen, and for Other Purposes," and by authority delegated to the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation under executive order of the President, dated July 11, 1917, all power-driven, cargo-carrying and passenger ships, above 2,500 tons D. W. capacity, under construction in your yard and certain materials, machinery, equipment, outfit and commitments for materials, machinery, equipment and outfit necessary for their completion are hereby requisitioned by the United States.

On behalf of the United States, by virtue of said act and said order, you are hereby required to complete the construction of said requisitioned ships under construction, and will prosecute such work with all practicable dispatch. The compensation to be paid will be determined hereafter, and will include ships, material and contracts requisitioned.

The Government had previously entered into agreements with foreign nations, principally Great Britain and Norway, for which many ships were being built in the United States, and it is said that 675 vessels will be affected by the order. The next step, according to reports, will be to requisition the ships now afloat and under American registry.

Although the revision of the War Revenue bill, still in the hands of the Senate Finance Committee, is far from complete, and the exact total remains to be determined, it seems likely that the sum provided for by the present bill, as finally drafted, will aggregate \$2,000,-

**War Revenue
Bill** 000,000. The additional sum of \$304,600,000, not previously provided for is to be raised by levying \$162,000,000 on corporation incomes; \$27,600,000 on individual incomes of \$15,000 and more; \$90,000,000 on distilled spirits; and \$25,000,000 on malt and beer. The Committee has announced that it is hoped that it will not be necessary to impose additional consumption taxes, although additional taxes of $\frac{1}{4}$ cent a pound on sugar, $\frac{1}{2}$ cent a pound on coffee, and 1 or 2 cents a pound on tea are under consideration.

General Crowder has issued an important communication to the effect that those who fail to present themselves to the exemption-boards will not only not escape being summoned to military service but will by the very fact of their failure to present themselves forfeit whatever claim they may have had to exemption. Their names will be listed with those who are called to the conscript armies, and refusal to obey will be dealt with according

**Resistance to
Draft**

to military procedure and penalties, which involve court-martial and in the case of desertion death. Aliens, except enemy-aliens, according to a new ruling may now be accepted for conscript service.

France.—On August 31 the Premier M. Alexandre Ribot replied in the Chamber to the declaration made a few days previously by Dr. Michaelis, the German Chancellor, that there was a secret treaty between France and Russia having in view plans of conquest.

**Ribot Answers
Michaelis**

Premier Ribot said that the German Chancellor had publicly challenged the French Government to declare whether in a secret sitting June 1 "the French Government had not made known to the Chamber of Deputies the terms of a secret treaty made before the Russian revolution whereby the Emperor had bound himself to support French pretensions to German territory on the left bank of the Rhine."

In reply to the challenge the Premier declared that the Chancellor's version contained "gross inaccuracies and lies." This was particularly true, he added, regarding the rôle the Chancellor attributed to the President of the Republic in giving an order to sign a treaty unknown to Premier Briand. In further explanation of the matter Premier Ribot said:

The Chambers know how things passed. M. Doumergue, ex-Premier and Foreign Minister, after a conversation with the Emperor, demanded and obtained M. Briand's authorization to take note of the Emperor's promise to support our claim to Alsace-Lorraine and to leave us free to seek guarantees against fresh aggression, not by annexing territories on the left bank of the Rhine, but by making an autonomous State of these territories which would protect us and also Belgium against invasion.

We have never thought to do what Bismarck did in 1871. We are, therefore, entitled to deny the allegation of the Chancellor, who evidently knows of the letters exchanged in February, 1917, at Petrograd and falsified since, as his most illustrious predecessor falsified the Ems dispatch. Whenever the Russian Government is willing to publish these letters we have no objection.

The Chancellor refrained from speaking about my declaration of March 21, wherein I repudiated in France's name any policy of conquest and annexation by force. He has wilfully forgotten my language, May 22, in the Chamber, saying we were ready to enter into conversation with Russia as to the object of the war, and if the German people, whose right to live and develop peacefully we do not contest, understood that we wished peace founded on the right of people, the conclusion of peace would thereby be singularly facilitated.

M. Ribot then read from his speech in the Chamber warning against those who wished to spread the conviction that France was seeking conquest and read the terms of the resolution adopted by the Chamber at that time declaring that peace conditions must include the liberation of territory occupied by Germany, the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France and just reparation for damage done in the invaded regions. The resolutions also favored the creation of a league of nations for the maintenance of peace.

The Premier emphatically denied that France wished any annexation of territory. The accusation brought against her would, he said, deceive no one "especially the democratic masses of the Russian people," whom their enemies were trying to mislead as to the intentions of the French democracy. In conclusion the Premier declared that France addressed itself, not to Germany, but to all who were witnesses or actors in the struggle which it had been maintaining for the past three years "and who know that there is in the depth of the French people's soul a deep attachment to the principles of justice, respect for people's rights" and true generosity.

Great Britain.—On August 4, the third anniversary of England's declaration of war against Germany, the Prime Minister delivered in London an address which was a call to the Allies to "tighten their belts to reach the summit of their hopes." After saying that the

Allies "are fighting to defeat the most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nations," he continued as follows:

We have checked the ambitions of Germany. The nations of the world have been climbing painfully the steps that led to national independence and self-respect. France and Great Britain reached the platform long ago, and then came a great power to thrust the nations back to the old dark servitude. That is what we have been fighting three years.

The Kaiser now adopts different language—fighting to protect German soil. Even now neither he nor his new Chancellor has said they would be satisfied with German soil. They talked glibly of peace but stammered when they came to the word "restoration." Before we enter a peace conference they must learn to utter that word to begin with.

War is a ghastly business. But it is not as grim as a bad peace. There is an end to a horrible war. But a bad peace will go on and on, staggering from one war to another. The Prussian war-lords have not yet abandoned their ambitions; they are only discussing the postponement of the realization of their ambitions.

The next time the Prussian war-lords meant to make sure. There must be no next time. Let us have done with it. Do not let us repeat this horror. Let us make victory such that national liberty, whether for small or great nations, can never be challenged. The small nation must be as well protected and guarded as the big nation.

We of this country cannot allow sectional organizations to make war or make peace. The nation as a whole has made war-sacrifices, pretty evenly divided among all classes, and the nation as a whole must make peace.

The Marquis of Crew, who presided at the meeting, declared that the Allies were cheered by the entrance of America into the war, and reminded the audience that the Allies' war aims are still "reparation and security."

Ireland.—In spite of the general political unrest and the local disturbances caused in certain districts by hotly

contested elections, the country is remarkably free from gross crimes. The Dublin *Weekly Freeman* quotes in support of this view the opinions of four prominent

The Verdict of the Judges judges, who in opening the Assizes made favorable comments on this happy condition of affairs. Before the King's County Assizes at Tullamore, Lord Chief Justice Campbell said that he was in a situation to congratulate the Grand Jury most sincerely on the peace and prosperity of the county. Not only was there no increase of any kind in serious crime, but the records of intemperance showed a very substantial decrease. In cases of the smaller or more insignificant breaches of the law, the figures had fallen from 1,975 in the previous year, to 1,647 this year. Addressing the Grand Jury at Wicklow Assizes, Lord Chief Justice Ronan said that there were only three bills to go before them. The county inspector had authorized him to say that the state of the county was quite peaceful and satisfactory. The specifically reported cases were only four, a remarkable decrease from last year, when they were ten. Judge Ross, opening the Meath Assizes at Trim, paid substantially the same tribute to the county, and Judge Gibson, at the Westmeath Assizes, passed a similar verdict. This general verdict of the judges at the various Assizes, all testifying to the law-abiding qualities of the people and the practical freedom from the grosser forms of crime is one of the most telling tributes to their sterling virtue and an official refutation of the charge of reckless violation of the law so often brought against them.

The selection of Sir Horace Plunkett as chairman of the Irish Convention, which was recorded last week in America, has been favorably received. Sir Horace

Sir Horace Plunkett

Plunkett is held in the highest esteem for his work in the agricultural organization of Ireland, which probably owes more to him than to any other individual. He has kept himself aloof from party politics, and although some of his views have not met with the approval of Irish Catholics he is everywhere respected for his disinterestedness, ability and modesty. He founded the Irish agricultural organization in 1894. He was Vice-President of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction between 1899 and 1907. He is a Commissioner of the Congested Districts Board. He is the author of several books dealing with Irish problems. He is as familiar with Irish opinion in the United States as in the British Empire.

Russia.—The situation has not altered much. The National Conference which is to meet at Moscow will be composed, it is reported, of 850 delegates, but Finland, the Ukraine and the Maximalist party will not be permitted to send representatives. The re-

Cabinet-Making

formed Cabinet, which M. Kerensky is said to be working at, will consist of fifteen or sixteen members, all

equal in power. The Constitutionalist Democrats, according to advices published July 29, were opposed to the Minister of Agriculture, M. Tchernoff, and M. Terestchenko, Minister of Foreign Affairs, remaining in the Cabinet, but Premier Kerensky was determined that they should stay, and rather than conform to the clamor for their resignation he gave up his portfolio on August 3 and the rest of the Cabinet, except the Vice-Premier, M. Nekpasoff, retired with him. Later, however, all withdrew their resignations with the exception of M. Terestchenko and M. Tchernoff. Premier Kerensky's action was also due to the failure to bring the Constitutional Democrats into the Cabinet.

On August 4 the political conference held at the Winter Palace came to an end. Each of the five parties represented passed a resolution declaring its confidence in the Premier and inviting him to form his own Cabinet. Four of the resolutions urged that a new ministry should follow the program of reform announced by M. Kerensky on June 21, but the Constitutional Democrats opposed the measure.

Important changes have also taken place in the army. General Alexis A. Brussiloff, commander-in-chief of the Russian troops, has resigned, and General Korniloff, commander on the southwestern front, has taken his place, General Tcheremisoff, commander of the Eighth Army, assuming the latter's post. Foreign Minister Terestchenko has sent a circular letter to the Allies in which he says:

The criminal propaganda of irresponsible elements was used by enemy agents and provoked a revolution in Petrograd. At the same time part of the troops in the front were seduced by the same propaganda, forgot their duty to the country and facilitated the enemy piercing our front.

The Russian people have been stirred by these events through the Government created by the revolution and with an unshakable will the revolt was crushed and its originators were brought to justice. All necessary steps have been taken at the front for restoring the combative strength of the armies.

The Government intends bringing to a successful end the task of establishing an administration capable of meeting all dangers and guiding the country in the path of revolutionary regeneration.

Russia will not suffer herself to be deterred by any difficulty in carrying out the irrevocable decision to continue the war to a final triumph of the principles proclaimed by the Russian revolution.

The feeling of insecurity at home is indicated, however, by an appeal to the people made by the Provisional Committee of the Duma, on August 2. It reads:

The riffraff of the army, overwhelmed by a riot of cowardice, is in flight. What has occurred in the army is merely an echo of what is happening all over Russia. This state of affairs is due to the usurpation of the rights and power of the Government by organizations of irresponsible parties and to the setting up of a double authority at the center, while there is no authority at all on the spot.

A catastrophe behind the front will bring with it the ruin of the army, which means the ruin of Russia. There is but one way of escape, and that is the establishment of a firm, power-

ful authority which should be prepared to exact from each and all the execution of their duty. The Government must be strong and unanimous; it must make for a single goal, the defense of our great country against the mortal peril that threatens from the quarrels of the revolutionists and the sweeping away of all authority on the spot.

The chief problem of the Government lies in immediate organization and in the administration of justice, without which all the reforms proposed by the Government must fail of realization. Until the convocation of the Constituent Assembly all legislative acts tending to radical change in the present régime, whether of the Government or of the social order in general, and tending to introduce even greater disturbance into the ideas of the people's rights, must not be allowed.

Premier Kerensky returned to Petrograd and attended a Ministerial meeting on August 4, subsequently issuing a manifesto in which he declared his intention of constructing a strong revolutionary government. A joint meeting of the executives of the Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Councils, by a vote of 147 to 46, expressed their confidence in the Premier, though the Maximalists strongly protested. Up to August 5 M. Kerensky had made scant progress in forming a new Cabinet. The Constitutional Democrats still opposed the Socialist program and refused to allow the Council of Deputies to control the Cabinet. They seemed ready to support M. Kerensky, but would not enter the Ministry. The Social Revolutionists appeared likely to withdraw support from the Premier. They demanded an inquiry within three days into the accusations against their leader, M. Tchernoff, ex-Minister of Agriculture, who is charged with having relations with the Germans, and if he is acquitted they want him restored to the Cabinet. Nearly all seemed agreed that M. Kerensky is the only man who can save the situation.

The members of the American mission to Russia who left this country May 19 safely returned to "a Pacific port" on August 3. At a luncheon given the following day to the commissioners Mr.

Root's Return Elihu Root expressed his belief in Russia's ability to weather the present storm. "I have abiding faith that Russia, through trial and tribulation, will work out, create and perpetuate a great, free, self-governing democracy," Mr. Root said in his address. He found in the Russian people "a high capacity for self-control and a noble idealism, heading always in a better way toward higher things." And he pleaded for deep sympathy for the nation "which is struggling with the problems that we have been studying for 140 years and have not yet solved."

James Duncan, Vice-President of the American Federation of Labor, said that the establishment of a stable government in Russia has been retarded by so-called reformers who have returned home from America. They spread the report that we had entered the war for sordid reasons and they tell the Russians that "The Government of the United States is more oppressive than the old régime at Petrograd."

The Canadian Conscription Controversy

GEORGE E. ROE

CERTAIN aspects of the Canadian conscription controversy have a bearing upon the relations of the Dominion to the United States. Some of these are incidental, some of larger significance. For example, it is admitted that selective conscription was long ago considered, that it was held to be a better way than voluntary recruiting, once the figures at first thought sufficient had to be multiplied, and that the idea was abandoned because of the ease with which the border could be crossed. The entry of the United States into the war not merely changed that situation, but after Congress had decided for selective draft the border became an object of concern from the opposite direction. The Canadian Conscription Act, by complementing the American, eliminates a boundary problem which might have been productive of international annoyance. There is a shrewd suspicion in some quarters that this was one of the compelling reasons for the introduction of the Canadian measure, although it is never given by the sponsors.

Secondly, the war has brought a change in the matter of finance. Prior to 1914, the dependence of Canada upon British capital was all but absolute. It was estimated that the private, the corporation, the municipal and the government indebtedness to Great Britain was not far short of \$3,000,000,000. For twenty years British money had been pouring into Canada in amounts sufficient to meet all reasonable and a good many uneconomic demands. When the war began that stopped. There has been a vast amount of British money spent in Canada since 1914, but practically all of it has been for war's destructive purposes. There have been heavy additions to Canada's debt in three years, but again for destructive, not constructive expenditures. One estimate is that in four years Canada will have borrowed four times as much as in the previous fifty. How much of this has been had from the United States there is no telling, but what is certain is that Canada has leaned upon New York to an extent never before within the range of contemplation. Two interesting divergent deductions follow: First, that it behooves Canada to stand well with the nation upon which it has placed and will continue to place this dependence, and, secondly, that the longer the process continues the more difficult it will be for Canada to guard the reality of her independence in face of her powerful neighbor. The arguments need not be elaborated. One makes for accelerated war effort, the other for a halt. Today two of the country's transcontinental railway systems are potentially bankrupt. To-morrow, French Canada foresees that the bankruptcy may be of another

sort, one that perhaps will imperil those institutions which are dearer to Quebec than anything else and which center round the laws, the language and the religion they brought with them from France and guarded for three hundred years as the ark of their covenant.

The third, and not the least important bearing upon the relations between Canada and the United States, has to do with material conditions after the war. The disarray into which fiscal and industrial conditions have been thrown will impose a heavy strain upon the statesmanship of reconstruction, and the present outlook is for measures of customs which will seriously interfere with trade between the two countries. Who knows to what that may lead? Up to 1897 there was tacit acceptance of the view that the United States had a footing of equality in Canadian markets. The grant, by the treaty of Washington, to the United States of equal navigation rights in the lower St. Lawrence, even where both its shores are Canadian, was a sign of the purpose of the period. Since 1897 there has been a departure from this condition, Canada's preferential tariff in favor of Great Britain setting up a new status. To this not much exception was taken, partly because the integrity of the British Empire was conceded, partly because the actual tariff-making, in the hands of a Liberal, low tariff administration, left little actual occasion for complaint. But now two new schemes have been foreshadowed. First was a suggestion, made at the Paris Conference, for a series of trade preferences to apply after the war, by virtue of which France, Russia, Italy or other allies of Great Britain would share in the advantages of British, including Colonial, markets, to the exclusion of others, notably, in the Canadian case, of the United States. Whether this plan still finds favor is not very clear. Whether the entry of the United States into the war involved any agreements or understandings which would alter the intent of the Paris Conference is not clear either. But in the meantime a new proposition has been made, the acceptance of which forms part of the war problem. A committee has been formed in London, backed by powerful influences, whose mission is to see that all the natural resources of the British Empire are pooled for the advantage of British Empire industry, commerce and defense organization. And when that has been achieved, then

With a view to encouraging the establishment of new industries in the British Empire and giving a measure of confidence and security to capital to be embarked therein, as well as assisting the expansion of existing industries, the Governments of the Empire are urged to make it obligatory on all Government departments, municipalities, railways, dock and harbor boards, gas, water and electric light corporations, and all such bodies spend-

ing public monies, or enjoying charters from Government or other public authorities, to purchase Empire-made goods and to place all contracts with British firms; exceptions to be made by special permission of proper authority, only in cases where such a course is considered to be at variance with public interests.

In theory this may not appear to be open to exception. In practice the great industrial organizations of the United States have shown a marked tendency to ignore the existence of a parallel of latitude, or even of a very large body of fresh water, when minerals or other materials useful in their operations have been discovered by their agents, and in the second place Canada has always been the best customer of American industrial producers. Peace in North America, and on terms consistent with self-respect, is for Canada a concern essentially her own. It has been threatened twice in the last half century over concerns that were not hers at all, over the Trent affair and over the Venezuela boundary dispute. It has been preserved, in delicate circumstances touching the fisheries and Alaska, by her own firmness and good sense.

All this has an evident bearing upon the basic elements of the present controversy over conscription. Will Canada throw her all into the war, and take her chances

on the complications that arise in her already difficult problems? Those who are for doing so, are for conscription, with the attendant borrowing, until the war ends. Will Canada, while there is yet time, give heed to the instinct of self-preservation before she has been reduced to a multiple dependency under which her initiative would disappear. Those who are for counting the effort already expended, for comparing it with that of others, especially with that of the United States whose fourteen fold man power and forty fold wealth are only entering on the scene, are against conscription and all that conscription involves. These latter have a difficult rôle, but their opponents are not reclining upon velvet. If they were they would not be passing revolutionary legislation without attempting to hold either general elections or by-elections to fill the numerous vacant places in Parliament. They would not be appealing to London for leave to continue in existence a Parliament already moribund instead of asking the people of Canada for a new lease of power. All this may help to a comprehension of the reason why, in Canada, there are two sides to a question which, looked at from a distance too great for details to be distinguished, appears to have but a single face.

Lloyd George and Literature*

MICHAEL WILLIAMS

IT may seem preposterous to connect Lloyd George with the revival of literature, for of all the swarm of politicians who so strangely rose into power in the days before the great war, and during it, Lloyd George was among the least distinguished for literary power or grace. Unquestionably, he possessed a personal force which in speaking he communicated through his words to his listeners, a force which gave him ascendancy over them; but it was evanescent, it did not remain in the words recorded by reporters or written by himself. In this respect he was like nearly all the other political leaders of the time, not merely in England, but in all the countries, save only in France and Ireland. In France, prose writing had become so well understood that most educated men had mastered a good, thoroughly expressive style. In Ireland, the spiritual force which inspired the higher types of public men more than personal motives could do, gave their utterances a throb of high pas-

sion and a vitality of inward truth which sealed them with peculiar distinction. In the United States, President Wilson attained tremendous contemporary fame as a literary stylist; but it is too difficult a task at this late day to get an understanding of how his academic and artificial writings attained to such a degree of favor. However, to return to Lloyd George, it is quite clear that he at least possessed no share of that high gift which, when it is allied with the unique opportunities afforded by national leadership in times of crisis, may lead to such permanent works of literary power and beauty as, for example, the Gettysburg address of Lincoln. Yet Lloyd George it was who, in the memorable speech delivered before the Commons in February, 1917, after Germany had declared its unrestricted submarine blockade of the Allied coasts, enunciated the policy the effects of which brought about the splendid revival of literature which marked the end of the twentieth century.

To be sure, Lloyd George did not have literature in mind when he announced that the importation of print paper into England would be cut some fifty per cent in order to save tonnage required for the importation of food. Nor did he have in mind the betterment of prose and the intensification of the spirit of poetry when, three

* These lines are an extract from Professor Belloc's "History of English Literature in the Twenty-first Century." The author of this standard work is a grandson of the famous Hilaire Belloc, the historian of the Great War.

months later, after the submarine campaign had caused serious results in England, he ordered another cut of fifty per cent in the amount of paper which it would be lawful to import into England. It is now clear that what Lloyd George had in mind was, first, the obvious necessity of saving tonnage, and second, the personal yet even more important object of *crippling the political power of the press*, especially of the Northcliffe press. The press had made Lloyd George, as it made most of the politicians of that age, because without the publicity afforded by the press—the perfectly enormous multiplication of the power of their speeches, and the power of their personalities, and the power of their hypnotic phrases, and the more sinister and direct power of their cabals and conspiracies—none of the politicians, in any of the so-called democratic countries, England, France, the United States, could ever possibly have attained such ascendancy as they most amazingly did. It was the press, and most chiefly the Northcliffe press, which stamped the seal of Lloyd George upon the British public's mind. Nobody knew this better than George, save Northcliffe, of course, and when, through his affiliations with the English Hearst, Lloyd George had ousted Asquith and secured the Premiership, the first real use he made of his new power was to torpedo the ship that had carried him over. He had at once been obliged to chaffer and dicker with many sources of power and influence in order to obtain a working machine, and he knew that Northcliffe was very likely to throw him down as effectually as he had set him up. It was up to him, therefore, to move first. Germany gave him the unique opportunity. The limiting of the huge tonnage of print paper imported into England struck everybody save the dismayed Northcliffe and the other great newspaper lords as a very sensible step. The fact that it immediately led to the total disappearance of a large number of the smaller and weaker journals did not particularly matter, in such a time of national danger and crisis. The fact that the newspapers which continued to exist were very much smaller was such an obvious improvement that again all save the proprietors rejoiced. And when six months later the raid of the submarines right into the hitherto safe portions of the Channel was followed by the total suppression of all journals save the official government gazettes, "for the period of the war," the public by that time was so well accustomed to the centralization of authority in the Government that save for a few minor disturbances, led by such determined publicists as the two Chestertons, Hilaire Belloc, A. R. Orage, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Darrell Figgis, and by the Sinn Feiners in Dublin, for a long time there was no obvious difference in the course of public affairs, nor was there any great change until the end of the war. We all know, now, how totally unexpected, save by a very few far-seeing ones, was the length of the war, and we are well acquainted with the events of the tremendous revolution by which the power of the oligarchy of incurably materialistic and money-seeking in-

terests and their political tools was at last broken, and the new era of Christian democracy based upon farmer proprietorship of the land, economically, and upon the Catholic Faith, spiritually, dawned at last upon the torn and desolated world. But what has not been so well known is the fact that out of that period of silence of the press arose the splendid revival of literature which coincided with the coming of the new age of economic justice and of spiritual power and beauty. It is to this aspect of the subject that I desire briefly to direct your attention.

It is of course exceedingly difficult for us today to gain anything save a partial understanding of the importance and power of the press in the days before the great war. And no more truly frightful souvenirs of that period have come down to us than the copies preserved in our libraries of the more typical "yellow" newspapers, as they were called; why, nobody now can say, except that we do know that the word "yellow" connoted sinister and deplorable ideas which nobody today would dream of connecting with that color, unless we went back to the teachings of the old mystics, who ascribed the color yellow to Judas, and taught that it signified idleness, and a horror of suffering and envy and treason. So, just before the great war, people talked of "the yellow streak" of cowardice, and the "yellow peril," and the "yellow press." How strange they seem, these huge, flimsy sheets, all yellowed indeed by the passage of time, with their huge, screaming, almost incoherent "head-lines," their "funny" pictures, their long, detailed, malodorous gloatings over human sins and sorrow and shame! How strange, especially, their assumption of an editorial authority, based absolutely on nothing at all save personal self-sufficiency or the personal interests of their proprietors and editors! Save here and there, nearly all really ethical reasons for being had passed away from the daily newspapers of that period, and with honorable and few exceptions, the press existed to make profits for its owners or to advance the personal interests of individuals and cliques. The magazines were nearly all devoted to various profit-making policies of supplying popular entertainment to large masses of the public. Those powerful and strong-willed individuals who realized the situation advanced their own interests and the interests of their chosen associates, or political parties, or theories, by seizing and wielding this almost universal power. Against the magnates of this oligarchical tyranny stood out only two classes, namely, the definitely religious part of the press, and the champions of various forms of social reform and social revolution which ran the gamut from highly idealistic, self-sacrificing ideas, some of which, and the best of which, came from the treasury of the Church, down to the most awful and diabolical teachings of the spirit of evil. And the press was never idle. Huge forests were felled each day to be made into paper to feed its voracious maw. Hundreds of millions of copies of newspapers were printed every hour of the day and night. Armies of writers,

reporters, editors, cartoonists, poets, to say nothing about the printers and the business people connected with the press, were employed. Everybody read, few people could think. Among those few only the minority had their thinking based upon the truths of religion. What wonder, then, that calamity came? The wonder is that it came not long before, and that having come, it was ever stopped before it swallowed up every vestige of civilization!

And necessarily the art of literature almost perished during that dark age of the power of the press. Respect for literary style, for the evidences of sincerity, high purpose, responsibility, was almost totally destroyed. On the one hand, art, wearied of the riot and dust of the market-place, turned aside and betook itself to sterile retreats where it practised strange developments only understandable by a few initiates. On the other hand, never before was there ever seen such a vast assemblage of would-be poets, prophets, story-tellers, teachers, critics and journalists, especially journalists. The clamor of their voices deafened and dizzied the humanity they assumed to lead and to mold. What a relief when silence so suddenly fell, and at last the soul of man was left undisturbed for a space to listen to the great voices which had never ceased to speak to it, but which had

been overwhelmed by the mere clamor of the press, the voices of true poets and authentic artists, and writers with a sense of responsibility.

And when the silence was again broken, and the press resumed its function, altogether too essential a one to be left for too long a period unused, those who first made use of it were those who were urged to the task by stronger motives than commercial profit, those who were ready to labor and labor on, teaching or inspiring, even if their audiences were small, and their own emoluments little or nothing at all. They were listened to with fresh attention, new zest, eager interest. Words which had been abused and worn-out recovered life and power. Wonder and mystery and true romance and thrilling reality were attached to the songs and stories and plays and books which came again to claim the attention of the world. For with the revival of the press, came the revival of religion, and art and literature recovered that which alone can make them great and enduring, namely, the sacramental sense; the expression of unseen truths, the faithful service of God. True art and true literature turned again to their two great tasks, namely, to the enheartening and the enlightenment of man, and to the battle against the false art and the false literature which would set up many idols in place of God.

Modern Jesuits in Modern Japan

G. RUSSELL DILKES, JR.

THE year 1918 will witness the semi-centenary of the new régime in Japan. It will be recalled that the Japanese Constitution, unlike the *Magna Charta* of Europe, is not a code of concessions forced from the throne by the people *vi et armis*. It is a peaceable instrument of the commonwealth agreed upon by both sides. Its adaptations are from the best in European experience: the navy from England, the army from Germany, the laws from France, and the educational system from America. Its religion alone has remained untouched by Western ideals. Despite the radical changes which this remarkable document has brought about in modern Japan within fifty years and despite the freedom permitted under it to religious worship, Shintoism and Buddhism still flourish and increase. The millions still worship in 100,000 polytheistic temples supported by generous and continuous donations, and the Government is constantly erecting new ones. Shintoism especially, a blend of polytheism and ancestor-worship intimately bound up in the entire system of court ceremonial, is as alive today as government patronage and social prestige can keep it.

But if the Japanese have not assimilated the Western

religion, they have seized with avidity upon Western culture. In 1873, the late Emperor Mutsuhito, in his self-selected era of "enlightenment" (*meiji*), officially commanded that education throughout his dominions "shall henceforth be so diffused that there shall not be a village with an ignorant family or a family with an ignorant member." As an astonishing consequence, today, in a land of 52,000,000 inhabitants there are 7,500,000 students and nearly 36,000 schools. Five government universities and numerous private ones are flourishing, having been founded by individuals or by religious bodies. In this land, a student is an envied personage distinguished by special garb. The populace look up to him: his elders foster him. A Japanese man of means invariably surrounds himself with several students, *shosei*, dependent upon him for bed and board in return for certain services. A promising college man is usually sent, either by the Government or by his family, to Europe or America to continue investigations along his special line of scientific or literary study.

In Japan all roads lead to Tokio. It is the sixth largest city in the world. In America it would be the third. It is almost as populous as Chicago. In point of numbers

it is one of the largest educational centers of the world. In a city of over 2,000,000 inhabitants, there are 165,000 public school boys and girls. The number of young people to be seen on the cars and the streets during the rush hours of the morning and evening is greater than the number to be seen anywhere in New York, Chicago or Boston.

In the *Kojimachi* section of the city, on the sites which originally contained the residences of the medieval nobles, the public offices have been erected. The old castle of Yeddo is now the imperial palace, set in the midst of world-famous gardens. Near by is Hybia Park and the imperial theater and the museum of arms, containing trophies of the wars with China and Russia. The Parliament buildings and the Supreme Court are not far from the various foreign legations in this the most dignified and aristocratic residential section of Tokio. Amidst such surroundings of historical and social distinction and government-business, the tourist will eventually come upon a specially handsome, new, brick and stone structure in modern European architecture, situated on the highest point in the center of Tokio, its roof-garden towering above the main building, affording a clear vista of the city and harbor, and westward of the fertile valley leading up to *Fuji San*. On one of the pillars of the iron gateway, will be observed a bronze tablet bearing, in Japanese *kanji* ideographs, the words, *Jochi Daigaku*, "Wisdom University." But in 1914, incorporated with the approbation and under the protection of the Government, it is by far the most imposing educational structure in the city. Until recently it was supported by alms chiefly from Germany and Austria. It is a Jesuit institution of learning, one of the best in the Orient.

"What is a Jesuit?" was once asked of Dr. Johnson. He replied: "A person who is cleverer than oneself." Lord Chesterfield agreed that "one sees most Jesuits excel in some particular thing." A member of the society has said that in recent times they "have been occupied chiefly in keeping school and in writing books which are not generally read."

As a matter of record, they are the authors of tens of thousands of volumes on subjects ranging from theology to music, from medicine to chemical discoveries, from literature in all its phases to the sciences in their every aspect, from seismography, through the dazzling mazes of astronomy down to archeology and jurisprudence and naval tactics. They have been in the business of higher education on a large scale for almost 400 years. They are rectors and professors in several hundreds of colleges, of "Wisdom," situated in all parts of the civilized world, in which annually 50,000 students are trained in a wide range of studies. Lord Macaulay assures us that as educators "they discovered the precise point to which intellectual culture can be carried without risk of intellectual emancipation." "Enmity itself," he says, "was compelled to own that in the art of man-

aging and forming the tender mind they had no equals."

In Asia especially have they distinguished themselves, honored the Government and sought to redeem the people from moral and intellectual stagnation. The Jesuit Martini was "the father of Chinese geography." The Jesuit Prémare is conceded "the most profound and thorough grammarian of the Chinese language." The Jesuit Ricci is called "the first sinologue," and the Jesuit Zotolli, "a landmark in the history of Chinese philology." The Jesuit college of Zi-ka-wei, near Shanghai, received warm tributes of praise from European potentates touring the East in state. For forty years it has been famous for its astronomical observations. The Chinese Government depends upon it for storm warnings against the destructive typhoon.

In Japan, the new Jesuit "University of Wisdom" not yet four years old, was instituted at the gracious command of Pius X., who commissioned Cardinal O'Connell to visit the late Emperor Meiji for the purpose. All of the professors rank as doctors of divinity: some of them are specialists as well in other branches of learning. Professor Tsuchihashi, the only Japanese Jesuit priest now living is a profound scholar in the Chinese language, Professor Gettelman is collaborator in a famous work on Socialism, Professor Dahlman is an authority on the religions of Japan, and Professor MacNeal, on literature and pedagogy. They are at present teaching eighty students, with the enrolment increasing forty per cent each year. In place of Latin, English as the world-language of commerce, and German as that of science and philosophy, are used. In place of Greek, Chinese is taught. To a student of Nippon, English is little less difficult than is Greek to us, and German a little more difficult than is Latin to us. The memory of a Japanese student is well-nigh prodigious; and, if his reasoning be somewhat weak, he is blessed peculiarly with quick perception. He is always courteous, exceedingly sensitive, very reserved, eminently susceptible to kindness and affection, it being impossible to drive him. Ping-pong indoors, and tennis, archery and baseball outdoors, are his favorite sports.

True, this modern Jesuit mission is not the first to set foot in Nippon. Four hundred years ago, the Jesuit Saint Francis Xavier made a whirlwind tour of the country; and the great Apostle of the Indies outdid the record of the great Apostle of the Gentiles in the number of his conversions to the Faith of The Master. But, although Xavier, in a few months, had redeemed thousands of natives with the waters of Baptism and started them on in their A B C of Catholicism, his wondrous Pentecostal miracle was a short time after annihilated almost as completely as though it had never been wrought. Hence, modern Jesuits in modern Japan are not continuing a work already established. Theirs is an infant enterprise, the mere cornerstone of a new undertaking in a new world, wherein they are giving, out of their intellectual bounty, that which the people

prize most dearly, education. With glorious traditions in the Orient such as theirs, what of their future in this land of the Rising Sun? Let Okaze, a bard of Nippon, speak and say:

The Mists
Enveil the hills in mystery
That in the distance darkly loom;
But the breeze that blows thereby
Comes laden with the scent of bloom.

May the scent of the bloom of virtue spread over Japan
from *Jochi Daigaku*.

"The Great Disillusionment"

FLOYD KEELER

EVIDENCES of the Romeward trend in Anglicanism continue to accumulate. Editorials are appearing with considerable frequency in Protestant Episcopal papers, the evident purport of which is to soothe the disquieted members of that church, to point out to them how much they have at home and to attempt to show them that they would gain nothing by making their submission to Catholic authority, but on the contrary would really lose thereby. One of the latest of such is an editorial which recently appeared under the above heading in the *Churchman*. Like most of the utterances of the "Broad Church" school, this one is vague and unsatisfying. Efforts to grasp anything definite in it seem doomed to disappointment. The editor's thesis, however, appears to be that while "it is undeniably true that a considerable number of members of the Anglican Church have become converts to 'Roman Catholicism' yet these same have experienced a 'great disillusionment,' and he instances a recently published letter from 'a returned convert' who was thus disillusioned and who after having become 'convinced of the claims of the Church of Rome, and after an experience within its membership rejoined the Anglican communion.' If this sentence represents the writer's real state of mind throughout, it reveals a great deal concerning him and helps to explain his various 'flops.'

Let us analyze: This individual "became convinced of the claims of the Church of Rome." Now what does that involve? It involves holding, in the first place, the belief that our Lord Jesus Christ founded one Church and that the Church in communion with the See of Rome is that Church. It involves holding that the very best that can be said for organized bodies outside of that communion is that they are in schism; most of them, however, are in actual, formal heresy as well. Moreover it involves the belief that outside of the Catholic Church a person is cut off from participation in the real corporate unity of the Church, a unity which cannot be lost to the Church itself but which to be en-

joyed by the individual must be had on the Church's own terms. It involves the belief that the one Church of our Lord's foundation possesses the attributes of infallibility, indefectibility and authority and that submission to that authority, especially as expressed in the supremacy of the Successor of St. Peter, is absolutely necessary to full Catholic life. All this and much more our "convert" accepted, "became convinced" was true. Then, "after an experience" within the Fold, he went back. One must indeed look for a tremendous "experience" to offset such claims when once they have been accepted, but what do we find? *Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus*. He "found many parties in the Roman communion"! In other words, he found that the Church did not do what her enemies accuse her of doing, namely, fetter men's intellects and ruthlessly press them into such rigid uniformity of thought and action that they become mere automata and but replicas one of the other. He looked for, and claims not to have found, "a welcome for the convert," which may have been due to what the convert expected for himself. Naaman, the Syrian, was similarly disappointed because of his ideas of his own importance but, heathen that he was, he had the good sense to listen to a wise counselor and exercise the humility necessary to follow the direction of God's Prophet. Perhaps if our "returned convert" had done the same, he might have recognized that discipline is often salutary and that even the "joy upon one sinner that doth penance" is perhaps more perceptible to the "angels of God" than it is to the sinner himself. "The sermons struck him as thin and unscriptural." What a cause for rejecting the Divinely ordered plan for the government of God's Church! But had he not learned that while Catholic preachers "preach the Gospel," yet the fulness of life and the continued power of holiness within the Church give them material which those outside do not possess and which makes it unnecessary that they should always be loading down their discourses with Scriptural texts and a show of erudition?

In his dealing with "other converts he found many depressing elements; a lack of sympathy, a tendency to commercialism." In other words, he found that the net is still gathering in "good and bad," that the "wheat and tares" are still "growing together until the harvest," just as our Blessed Lord said they would, and he did not find Heaven let down upon earth. Finally, we are told "he began even to long for the united worship of the Anglican Church." This sentence surely explains a great deal, and shows that our "returned convert" is one of those persons who cannot be satisfied or pleased anywhere, for here he is pictured longing for something which everyone knows is non-existent. Where he expected to find this "united worship" for which he longed is not told us. Its whereabouts would be interesting, for no one else has discovered it. Certainly even among the "parties" and

"partisanship" he claims to have found in the Catholic Church he did not find one extolling the Mass, teaching the Seven Sacraments and the Invocation of Saints, whilst another condemned all these things as "blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits" or as "fond things vainly invented." Yet that condition most certainly is found in the Anglican Church for whose "united worship" he became so sick at heart. Nothing can be done for one who has worked himself into that frame of mind and it is no wonder he went back or that we are told: "He does not hesitate to speak of the swift degeneration of the majority of English clergy who have changed their allegiance to Rome." He says it, but can he prove it? A few of the many men whose names spring to mind, Newman, Faber, Manning, Ward, Maturin, Benson do not show it. And among those still with us the present writer has met many whose lives certainly belie such a statement. Undoubtedly the Catholic Church, in her charity, has received some Anglican "black-sheep" and their "swift degeneration" may have been quite evident, made noticeable perhaps, though sheer contrast with others who did not exhibit it, but to say that a "majority" of Anglican converts thus go downward is simply a slander which scarcely deserves recognition.

Such methods show that the Protestant Episcopal Church is becoming profoundly stirred over the frequency with which its people are "going to Rome" and vague remarks, based as the editor of the *Churchman* confesses, on "guess work" such as that "some critics have asserted that the small thin current of converts toward the Roman communion is more than offset by something resembling mass movements of abandonment" will not serve to stem the tide. The present writer in his Anglican days was not at all "pro-Roman" and used to seek for justification for such statements, but the results of his most diligent and interested investigations always led him to find just the opposite. At present he can recall among his personal acquaintance twenty former Protestant Episcopal clergy who are now devoted and loyal Roman Catholics, and but two who, having been received into the Catholic Church, have afterward reverted. Not all come to "the great disillusionment" apparently. And the trouble is that the "disillusionment" is neither so "great" nor so widespread that it is noticeable and so when they find a case of it, editors are obliged to herald it abroad and on their own dicta build up "mass movements" supported not by facts but by veiled reference and innuendo. The truth is that Catholic-minded Anglicans in increasing numbers are finding in the true Faith, not cessation from all troubles or a place where they need no longer think or work to gain their souls' salvation, but a place where, when they have done their share, they are not in doubt as to the position they have occupied but can rest assured that their labor has not been in vain.

"Your Red Cross"

GERALD C. TREACY, S.J.

IN the *Red Cross Magazine* for May there is a well-written article giving the history of the development of relief work in war. Very properly it traces Red Cross work back to the Geneva Convention of 1863. Very improperly it gives the reader the impression that the care of the wounded in battle was *first* taken up by the Red Cross. "No one has ever told the frightful story of the wounded and sick in the wars of history. The plain facts are that the tale is horrible beyond all imagination. For there was no one that could or ever did care for them. The utmost ever done was impromptu charity on the spot." Now the writer of the article, entitled "Your Red Cross," whose name does not appear, must have known that Florence Nightingale and Mary Stanley were actively engaged in the care of the wounded in the Crimea, and the Crimea had passed into history when the Geneva Conference took place in October, 1863. No one can gainsay the fact that the Red Cross has brought relief work up to a high standard of efficiency, and no American would minimize the good it has wrought during the present war. However, while lauding the noble women of the present who have donned the nurse's uniform, it is unjust to forget or ignore the women of the past who without the aid of an up-to-date organization did their share for the sick and suffering as only women can. Florence Nightingale and Mary Stanley were not merely engaged in doing "impromptu charity on the spot." They were both aided by Catholic Sisters of Mercy and this before the Geneva Conference was heard of. While Florence Nightingale's name is a common possession of those who are interested in war relief work, it is surprising that Mary Stanley's work in the Crimea is not more generally known.

To appreciate the work of Mary Stanley it must be remembered that the British Government did some very fatal blundering in the Crimean War. In December, 1854, the leader of the Opposition bitterly arraigned the party in power, saying:

You have chosen a winter campaign, and what have been your preparations for it? In November you gave orders to build huts. You have not sent out that clothing which is adapted to the climate. You have commenced a winter campaign in a country where most of all it should be avoided. You have commenced such a campaign, a great blunder, without providing for it, the next great blunder. The huts will arrive in January and the furs will probably meet the sun in May. These are your preparations!

Soon the press of the day was filled with accounts of the neglected state of British hospitals in the East. When Inkermann and Alma were set down glorious but red in the chronicles of battle, there was neither linen nor lint for gaping wounds. Ten doctors were at the hospital at Scutari and orderlies were the only nurses. England's allies had called upon the nursing Sisterhoods, and the cry was raised, "Are there no such nurses in England? Can our women do nothing for us in this fearful emergency?" The upshot of it was that some sixty nurses were found in London, but only eleven of reputable character could be chosen. Besides the nurses of those days there were lady volunteers. In most cases these ladies came from distinguished English families, while the professional nurses were far from being what the profession demands to-day, both as to skill and character. In less than six months over sixty per cent of the so-called nurses that accompanied Florence Nightingale were sent back to England, chiefly for misconduct. She was so afraid to employ the second band that came to her assistance that they were an entire month in the East in idleness. She dared not trust them in the wards alone! It was at this point that Mary Stanley inaugurated the policy of appointing the nurses as assistants to the lady volunteers and the Sisters of Mercy. Indeed, all through the history of nursing in the Crimea, Mary Stanley

was more successful in meeting situations than was Florence Nightingale. The plain fact is that when facing a difficulty of more than ordinary moment, both relied on the skill and cooperation of the Sisters of Mercy. A writer in the *North British Review* of February 2, 1862, puts the case thus:

It has been remarked that while in the Crimea our hired nurses disgraced themselves by incompetency and disobedience and many of our volunteer ladies were obliged to return home ill or worn out, the Sisters of Mercy held on with unflagging spirit and energy, never surprised, never put out, ready in resource, meeting all difficulties with a cheerful spirit, a superiority owing to their previous training and experience.

Shortly after relief work began in the Crimea, Mary Stanley was given charge of the General Hospital at Constantinople. Cleanliness was the first objective of her campaign. Her task was no light one. The Eastern hospitals were alive with vermin. The blankets were brown with fleas which the soldiers dubbed "light infantry." Under Mary Stanley the Sisters began a cleaning-up process. The situation that met Mary Stanley and the Sisters can be seen from a letter of one of the latter written to the London convent at the time:

It seems as if we go to bed to become the food not of worms but of fleas, flies, bugs, ants, mosquitoes, while we are entertained by the music of rats, dogs and donkeys, and the roaring of cannon. . . . We have just received hundreds of poor creatures worn out with sufferings, frightful beyond imagination, endured at the Crimea, where the cold is so intense that a soldier described to me the Russians and the Allies in a sudden skirmish, and neither side able to draw a trigger. . . . Imagine then what they have been through, in the trenches, lying in water and snow, eating raw beef and biscuit, never seeing a bed, not getting a drink for days.

In addition to the troops, refugees fell to the care of Mary Stanley and the Sisters. Lord Napier tells in his reminiscences a story that speaks for the readiness of the black-garbed nurses to handle a sudden emergency:

During the Crimean War I held a diplomatic position under Lord Stratford de Redcliffe the British Ambassador in Constantinople. One morning he said to me: "Go down to the port. You will find a ship there loaded with Jewish exiles, Russian subjects from the Crimea. It is your duty to disembark them. The Turks will give you a house in which they may be placed. I turn them over entirely to you. . . ." I went down to the shore and received about two hundred persons, the most miserable objects that could be witnessed, most of them old men, women and children, sunk in the lowest depths of indigence and despair. . . . I placed them in the cold ruinous lodgings allotted to them by the Ottoman authorities. . . . I went back to the Ambassador and said: "Your Excellency, these people are cold and I have no fuel or blankets; they are hungry and I have no food; they are very dirty and I have no soap; what am I to do with these people?" "Do," said the Ambassador, "get a couple of Sisters of Mercy; they will put all to rights in a moment." I went to the Mother Superior and asked for two Sisters. She ordered two to follow me. They were ladies of refinement and intellect. I was a stranger and a Protestant and I invoked their assistance for the benefit of Jews. Yet these women made up their bundles and followed me through the rain without a look, a whisper, a sign of hesitation. From that moment my fugitives were saved. . . . No one saw the labors of those Sisters for months but myself. . . .

The Koulali hospitals had only been in nominal charge of Florence Nightingale. Mary Stanley took over their real care together with Miss Hutton, another very efficient relief worker. Both ladies left the entire charge of the nursing to the Mother Superior of the Sisters of Mercy. "Koulali," wrote Miss Taylor, one of the lady volunteers, "under the administration of the Sisters, became the pride of the ladies and nurses who worked in it, the admiration of all who visited it, and the model hospital of the East."

After the fall of Sebastopol, Sir John Hall asked the Sisters

to take charge of the General Hospital at Balaklava. Florence Nightingale had informed him that her nurses would be withdrawn shortly. The only reason their superior consented to the withdrawal of the Sisters to Balaklava was the fact that greater needs were calling for their ministry there than at Koulali. So on October 8, 1855, the Sisters left Koulali and within two days they came in sight of Balaklava, in the teeth of a terrible gale that kept them tossing about in the Black Sea some days longer. The Superior, who was impatient to be beside the sick soldiers, attempted to land in the angry swell, and the attempt nearly cost her her life. At the first sign of a calm the entire party landed safely, and on October 12 Sir John Hall met them and immediately named the Superior as Superintendent of the Balaklava General Hospital. A motley throng of patients crowded the place and overflowed into fourteen huts scattered around the vicinity. The sick troops had received some attention, but the civilians attached to the army as mule drivers and in other capacities were regarded as intruders and had suffered from neglect. While attending to the troops, the Sisters did not forget these men of many nations, civilian adventurers, rendered useless by sickness for military duty.

An outbreak of cholera kept the Sisters busy night and day, and one of their number, Sister M. Winifred Sprey of Liverpool, fell a victim to the scourge. She was sick only a day, and died calmly and sweetly, as the chaplain, Father Woollet, finished the prayers for the departing soul. The funeral took place the next day, the Sisters in procession with lighted tapers, three priests and several doctors attending the burial, while four soldiers among the many she had ministered to asked the favor of carrying the body to the last resting place. The faithful band just returned from the cemetery when a request came for two of their number to attend a new cholera case.

It is strangely touching, wrote one of the doctors, to think of their turning from the terrible scene of cholera patients in their agony, to the sight of one who lay so calmly there, arranged for her burial, holding the parchment on which were written the vows she had made to devote herself to God and her suffering fellow-creatures. She had finished her work; theirs lay before them.

Indeed, so violent was the epidemic that for a time its suppression appeared out of the question. "We never leave the patients night or day," wrote one of those now forgotten nurses. The medical authorities at the time were experimenting with chloroform as a remedy, so constant watching was imperative.

Peace was hastened by the death of Nicholas I., the Russian Emperor, not, however, before another victim was claimed. This time typhus took Sister M. Elizabeth Butler away from her apostolate amid the sick and wounded. Two white crosses mark the graves on the brow of a rugged hill, cloistered by an iron railing set in cut stone. The Black Sea moans beneath them. The Sisters of Mercy did not remain long at Balaklava after the proclamation of peace. Mary Stanley returned to England and became a Catholic. Her conversion created a stir at the time, for she was the daughter of the Bishop of Norwich and sister to the more celebrated Dean of Westminster Abbey. Her after-life she devoted to charity. Among her benevolent works was the establishment of a home, a lodging house for women, a laundry at Westminster, a penny savings bank and a society for the help of the sick poor. At her own risk she became a contractor for Government clothing, thereby supplying work to soldiers' widows and other poor women. During the Lancashire cotton famine she rendered noble service. Her friend Lady Herbert enshrined her memory by erecting the Mary Stanley Bed in the hospital for incurables at Great Ormond Street, London. It was very fitting to choose this hospital for the Mary Stanley memorial, as it was partially founded as a thank-offering for the work of the Sisters of Mercy in the East, and its first Superior and the group of nurses on the first staff had served the sick and wounded in Turkey and Russia during the Crimean War.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters, as a rule, should be limited to six-hundred words.

"What Ireland Wants"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Towards the conclusion of a symposium by thoughtful persons on Ireland a critic of mine made inquiry as to the Home Rule bill and instanced some of its impotencies. I have since possessed myself of that bill and to be quite fair beg to quote first of all the powers which are excepted from the Irish people: "(1) The Crown. (2) Peace and war. (3) The Army and Navy. (4) Treaties with foreign powers. (5) Dignities or titles of honor. (6) Treason, treason-felony, alienage, naturalization, and domicile. (7) Trade outside Ireland (with important exceptions), bounties on the export of goods, quarantine, and navigation outside Ireland. (8) Postal services outside Ireland. (9) Lighthouses, buoys, and beacons. (10) Coinage, legal tender, and weights and measures. (11) Trade marks, copyright, or patent rights."

With these compare the powers which this much reviled Home Rule bill confers upon the Irish people: "(1) Education, primary, intermediate, and university. (2) The business of the Land Commission, including the fixing of rents, but excluding land purchase. (3) The business of the Congested Districts Board. (4) The business of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction. (5) The business of the Local Government Board, and the whole business of local government, including poor relief, lunacy, and lunatic asylums. (6) Trade and navigation within Ireland. (7) The business of the Board of Works. (8) The creation, stimulating, and fostering of Irish industries (including fisheries) by exports on production, subsidies, preferential railway freights, and a score of other indirect means. (9) The criminal law, except as regards treason. (10) Licensing. (11) Posts, telegraphs, and telephones, within Ireland. (12) The Irish civil service. (13) The Dublin metropolitan police. (14) Reformatory and industrial schools. (15) Prisons. (16) The business of the Registrar of Petty Sessions. (17) The business of the Public Record Office. (18) Banks and banking. (19) The judiciary from top to bottom. (20) The factory laws. (21) Trade boards. (22) Railways, tramways, and canals. (23) Company legislation. (24) The business of the Board of Charitable Donations and Bequests. (25) Hospitals and charities. (26) The business of the Registrar-General and of the Registry of Deeds."

Yet this prospect is bitterly criticised by both Unionists and Sinn Feiners, and I am afraid for the same reason, that they fear they would be unlikely to enjoy a fair share of patronage, a fear I believe to be groundless.

As far as the financial prospect of the bill goes, Dr. Kelly, Bishop of Ross, one of the hierarchical representatives at the Convention writes:

In finance Ireland is treated with much generosity. Under the former bills she should pay out of her own taxes for all her own services, and contribute towards the maintenance of the Army and Navy, and other Imperial services from £2,500,000 to £3,500,000 a year. Under the new bill Ireland will have the expenditure for her own benefit of every penny of taxation raised in Ireland for many years to come. Even the increase of the taxes created by the Lloyd George budget will now be spent in Ireland and for Ireland. Moreover, for some years to come Great Britain will contribute a sum of £2,000,000 a year to make up the deficit between Irish expenditure and Irish revenue. (He might have added that a sum of money will also be paid yearly to provide Ireland with a surplus.) Mr. Gladstone retained to the Imperial Parliament the imposition of all duties of customs and excise, but the new bill, while it does not confer on Ireland full power in this respect, goes much further in all respects, and in practice gives unlimited control over beer and spirits.

Dr. Ross' economic knowledge of Ireland is greater than that

of any single individual in America. There is no doubt Ireland will reap something from the present Convention even superior to this best of the three Home Rule bills, all three of which have at different times been rapturously applauded by the majority of the Irish at home and abroad, but that is no reason for contemning and attacking what after all, if it had been put into action in 1913, would undoubtedly have been accepted as a settlement in this generation at least. Half a loaf is always better than no bread and if now we are going to get a whole loaf, let us not abuse Mr. Redmond who spent his life making the present prospect possible.

St. Johnsbury, Vt.

SHANE LESLIE.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

An answer to my good friend Mr. Woodlock, who asks "What Ireland Wants?" may be had from two very potent and very popular sources. The answer comes directly and with unquestionable authority and force from the Sinn Fein party, which will take nothing less than absolute freedom for Ireland. Its members will defend that claim with their lives, and they, politically and numerically, represent the *real* Ireland of to-day. Another answer comes from the Irish and their descendants in America, who, basing their demands upon their knowledge of events in Ireland, coupled with the pledges and war promises of Mr. Wilson, have found a league representing millions of American citizens who call themselves "The American Friends of Irish Freedom." This league has sent tons of literature signed by them and their friends, requesting that the United States demand of England the same liberty for Ireland that England professes to demand of Germany for Belgium. The great difficulty, however, lies in the fact that our press, seemingly subsidized by Lord Northcliffe and other Englishmen, has not done justice to Ireland's claim.

New York.

JOHN N. DOOLEY.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Of course Mr. Thomas F. Woodlock knows that no one can tell him with absolute certainty whether his belief that Ireland should—or is it must?—remain within the Empire with colonial Home Rule, or the hope of the Sinn Fein for a free and independent Ireland, represents Irish opinion today. That can only be determined by a vote of the Irish people in Ireland, and the Empire will take care that there shall be no such vote. But if the opinion of a majority of Americans of Irish birth or descent, with respect to Ireland's political future, be a reflex of the opinion of the majority in Ireland on the same questions, then assuredly we may tell him, with confidence that we are right, that the people of Ireland want a free and independent Ireland. For if there be one American of Irish birth or descent who wishes, or is content, to have Ireland remain a British dependency, there are ten thousand who do not. Besides, is there a living man who believes that England will give to Ireland the same form of government in all respects that Canada has?

Every man of Irish birth or descent, and a great many others, will admit that it is Ireland's right, or at least should be her right, to say whether she shall become a nation once again or remain within the British Empire. But few Englishmen or English sympathizers will. Men who look with wet eyes and aching hearts upon stricken Belgium and cry that we must sacrifice every man, if necessary, to restore freedom to Belgium, look with dry eyes and steeled hearts upon prostrate Ireland, and laugh when it is suggested that she, too, should be free. Will some one tell why that is? Will some one give one reason for the restoration of Belgium's independence that cannot be advanced with ten thousand times greater force in behalf of Ireland's independence? Both were conquered by might against the will of the people; one over 700 years ago, the other three

years ago. Neither conqueror had a moral right to conquer. Does the passing of time make that which was morally wrong right? If it does, what reason can be advanced against the contention that in this progressive age three years subjugation is sufficient to justify the perpetual subjugation of Belgium? If freedom be denied to Ireland on the ground that the safety of the Empire requires that she should remain a part of the Empire, can any reason be given why the same rule should not apply as between Belgium and Germany?

The Irish question is said to be a perplexing one. It is nothing of the kind. The difficulty is with her rulers. Let the people of Ireland be free to decide whether they wish to become independent or remain a part of the British Empire; let the same rule with respect to a majority of a people having the right to decide the policies of a country be applied to the question of Irish independence, and the question will be speedily, permanently and satisfactorily settled. Why should not the majority rule apply to the Irish question?

New York.

JOSEPH FORRESTER.

"Literature and Twaddle"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Dr. Walsh, in the last two paragraphs of his article entitled "Literature and Twaddle," in the issue of AMERICA for July 21, raises the old question, What is Literature? In the last paragraph but one he quotes Conrad, indirectly I presume, since the passage is not marked off by inverted commas. I shall be obliged for reference, so to speak, to chapter and verse.

In the last paragraph he gives us a test consisting of three questions by which we may decide if the book we have been reading is literature, and concludes by saying: "In that case you have been reading twaddle and not literature."

I should like to know if Dr. Walsh means "novel" when he writes "book," and also what he means by "in that case," which in the context is evidently more than ambiguous.

Lastly, it would be of interest to me, and possibly also to some of the other readers of your paper, to read Dr. Walsh's proof that the answer to his third question would have any weight in the world, in determining whether what one has been reading is, or is not, literature.

Providence.

FRANCIS R. BURKE.

Mr. Atteridge on Air-raids

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Like all Englishmen, in discussing the morals of other peoples Mr. A. Hilliard Atteridge is quick to see the mote in his brother's eye. In your issue of July 21 he uses one page and a half of your good white print-paper to rehash the stock argument that a German airman's frenzied delight is in killing English civilians, preferably women and school children.

Mr. Atteridge says, among other things: "It is for the honor of the British Air Corps that . . . they always take the risk of flying low for the purpose of confining the attack to its military object and avoiding as far as possible damage to the civil population." This solicitude on the part of H. M. Air Corps is doubtlessly the result of the English theory that it is more humane to cause the civil population of Germany to die a lingering death from starvation, due to a blockade which President Wilson called "illegal and indefensible," than to blow them into eternity painlessly, but expeditiously, by the indiscriminate use of air-bombs!

Just think of the excellent use to which that page and a half of your good white print paper might have been put! Mr. Atteridge might have written an article entitled "Why Worry About Cruelties in Ireland? The Irish do not; they are accustomed to it." Or he might have composed a charming little ditty with a caption something like this: "Vodka or the

Roaming Romanoffs"; and if perhaps the "ugly novelty" of the aerial bombardment—"with the heartrending cries and sufferings of the little martyrs" (Anglo-newspaper "stuff")—had awakened his soul to its very depths, he might have given us the joy of reading a dissertation on "The Fight for Democracy, Series 1: Greece." But, alas! It was not to be. Maybe, in the distant future, Mr. Atteridge may amuse AMERICA's readers by a witty article on "Miss Cavell and Padraic Pearse: An Anglo-Saxon Appreciation." But, unfortunately, for the present we must be content with the immorality of Germany's Air Corps, spread over a page and a half of your good white print-paper.

Philadelphia, Pa.

J. ALLYN POWELL.

"Let Them Get Acquainted"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Are not those in authority in Catholic colleges and schools doing all within their power and scope to encourage Catholic marriages and to discourage mixed marriages? They have long been waging a vigorous war along these lines. But what have Catholic parents been doing? Allowing Catholic young men and women to choose their own companions, places of amusement, etc. One noble teacher was heard to sigh and say: "We have the young folk with us only a few short hours. If we are not backed up by parents how worthless are all our efforts!" Why should Catholic parents wish to shift their responsibility to Catholic educators? The latter can but teach the principles, and it is for the parents to see they are put into practice. It is sad to realize how many parents are afraid to assert their authority. Because the young person has been to college and the parents have not, may give him better knowledge of books, but certainly not of life learned in the greater school of time and experience. Arouse Catholic parents to courage and endeavor!

Laredo, Texas.

A. H. K.

Mr. Wells' Invisible God

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the course of an excellent article on Mr. H. G. Wells' recent work, "God the Invisible King," in AMERICA for June 23, Mr. Thomas F. Woodlock touches upon some of the absurdities, illogicalities, and whimsies in which the book abounds. He does not hesitate to pronounce against its dogmatism and its frequent shockingly bad taste, yet he finds it impossible not to be tolerant and even sympathetic toward the spirit of the book. "It is this spirit that is a portent of the times and it may be welcomed as perhaps the beginning of a movement toward the truth." With this last statement of Mr. Woodlock I should like to take issue.

As Mr. Wells himself points out, and his reviewer places due emphasis upon the fact, the important thing is not what the author of the work in question thinks about God, nor what changes have taken place in his personal views concerning religion. The important thing is whether the generation of whose spirit Mr. Wells informs us that he is the scribe, agrees with him in this new theology. He tells us that he has not found this new faith growing up in himself alone.

He has found it or something very difficult to distinguish from it growing independently in the minds of people he has met, English, Americans, Bengalis, Russians, French, people brought up in "a Catholic atmosphere," Positivists, Baptists, Sikhs, Mohammedans. The new teaching is also traceable in many professedly Christian books and it is to be heard from Christian pulpits.

From other passages in the book it is evident that the prophet of the new religion has become convinced from his reading and his dealings with men of various creeds that there is to be a general breaking up of religious beliefs. The standards of

Christ, of Mohammed, of Buddha and other spiritual leaders are being rapidly deserted. Mankind, practically as a unit, is making ready to enlist under the banner of the Wellsian God.

This of course is a bit chimerical. Even though all others should fail, there is one Church which can never fail, for she is builded upon the rock. However, we readily grant that Mr. Wells' prediction is being verified in part. For, aside from his authority, there is ample reason for believing that the disintegration which has been taking place in non-Catholic religious bodies will eventually culminate in a world-wide cult of Anti-christ. Looked at in this wise, "God the Invisible King" may truly be hailed as a "portent of the times." But it should hardly "be welcomed as the beginning of a movement toward the truth."

Protestant Christianity with all its errors and defects lies immeasurably nearer the truth. One may safely say the same of Islamism and others of the Eastern religions. It may even be questioned whether Mr. Wells' present position is much of an improvement over what Mr. Woodlock refers to as "the hopeless negation of drab Victorian days." The agnosticism, learned in the school of Huxley and Spencer, has not been abandoned. On the contrary it has been incorporated as a fundamental tenet of the new creed. Mr. Wells has simply added a few more errors to the old ones. Hence his new departure is not a turning back toward the truth, but a going farther on in the way of perdition. Let me quote his own words:

At present if anyone who has left the Christian communion declares himself a believer in God, priest and parson swell with self-complacency. There is no reason why they should do so. That many of us have gone from them and found God is no concern of theirs. It is not that we who went out into the wilderness which we thought to be a desert, away from their creeds and dogmas, have turned back and are returning. It is that we have gone on further and are beyond that desolation. Never more shall we return to those who gather under the cross. By faith we disbelieved and denied. By faith we said of that stuffed scarecrow of Divinity, that incoherent accumulation of antique theological notions, the Nicene Deity, "This is certainly no God" and by faith we have found God. . . . This language needs no comment.

Oxnard, Calif.

JOSEPH R. STACK, S.J.

The Bible and the State Library

To the Editor of AMERICA:

A few days ago, while I was in the reading room of the New York State Library in the Education Building, reading "The Confessions of Saint Augustine" (Harvard Classics), I became somewhat perplexed in regard to the real meaning of a Biblical quotation employed therein. To clarify the situation I called for a copy of the Douay version of the Bible. After considerable delay on the part of the page, who was searching for the book downstairs, the startling intelligence came back, "We haven't a copy."

I think a state of affairs like this is a shame and a disgrace, an inexcusable laxity on the part of the library officials. To think that among the 375,000 volumes in the main library of the great Empire State there is not one copy of the Catholic Bible! Had I been looking for a King James version I would have been handsomely accommodated. A glance at the catalog under classification "Bible" reveals the following: "Modern Readers' Bible," Moulton; "Murray's Illustrated Bible Dictionary," Rev. William C. Piercy; "Holy Bible," American Standard Edition, published by Thomas Nelson & Sons; "The Bibles of England," Andrew Edgar, D.D.; "The Holy Bible," King James version; "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament," Dr. Briggs and Dr. Salmond; "A Harmony of the Gospels," Wm. A. Stevens and Ernest D. Burton; "Hastings Dictionary of the Bible"; and "Cruden's Complete Concordance to the Holy Scriptures."

Judging by numerous signs I conjecture that the library officials thought the Catholic Bible could be replaced by Y. M. C. A. pamphlets, Year Books of the Christian Endeavor, almanacs of the "Ladies' Aid," and above all by tiresome statistics of the Protestant missions and their progress in Korea, Abyssinia and elsewhere.

Not only do we find the Holy Bible missing from this great educational center, but also acknowledged and accepted textbooks of Catholic thought in different branches. In ethics we fail to find the works of Fathers Rickaby, Cronin, Humphrey and Hull. In rational philosophy, the works of Aveling, Dr. Coffey, Hettinger, Father Rickaby and Dr. Driscoll. In education, the treatises of Brother Azarias, "Jesuit Education" by Father Swickerath, and Dr. Pace's work. In sociology and economics, the works of Father Burke, Mgr. Parkinson, Goldstein-Avery, Bishop Stang and Father McLaughlin.

In conclusion, I think that if the State of New York is rich enough to purchase Crowley's "Romanism, A Menace to the Nation," and pay the subscription for "Tom Watson's Magazine," then certainly from the thousands of dollars of Catholic taxpayers it ought to secure a Catholic Bible and give it as prominent a place as is accorded to decidedly anti-Catholic journals.

Albany, N. Y.

EDWIN A. DUGAN.

Remedies for Errors in Latin

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Every priest knows that the final syllable in the words *omnia* and *sæcula* is short and unaccented, and also that the first syllable in *sæcula* and *sæculorum* is long. Yet how few pronounce them so! By accentuating *om*, *sæ* and *sæ*, and making no pause after *a* in *omnia* and *sæcula*, the true quantities of these three words is easily secured in the phrase *per omnia sæcula sæculorum*. *Michaeli* and *Michaelem* are, of course, words of four syllables, having the first *e* long. By accenting the first syllable, as well as the third, the true pronunciation becomes easy enough. The elision of the *e* in *Kyrie* is an ancient error, for we find *Kyri* simply in some of the old MS. *Hora* books. Then the consecutive *e* and *i* in *eleison* do not form a diphthong, but contrary to etymological custom the *e* is long and the *i* short. By accenting the first and alternate syllables all goes well in *Kyrie eleison*. By accenting the first and every alternate syllable in the sentence *Introibo ad altare Dei* it is easier to give the true than the false quantity to the *ta* in *altare*. Yet how often one hears that syllable short!

Cardiff, Wales.

H. PARLIN.

Classification of Prisoners

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The finger-print and Bertillon systems prove that there are no two people alike in outward form and appearance. We fail to find two with the same disposition and habits. This shows the wonderful work of the Creator. Yet notwithstanding this indisputable truth, there are optimistic people in the world who think they can improve upon the work of the Almighty and pick congenial associates. Why not entrust to them the making of marriages, the selection of husbands and wives, if they can demonstrate that they have been wiser and more successful than others in the ordering of their own lives? The vague terms used by sentimental prison reformers, such as "morons," "defective delinquents," "feeble-minded," "strong criminalistic tendencies," "borderline cases," are only examples of studied ambiguity which serve to conceal their ignorance of the primary causes of hidden conditions.

Boston.

JOSEPH MATTHEW SULLIVAN.

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

SATURDAY, AUGUST 11, 1917

Entered as second-class matter, April 15th, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3d, 1879.

Published weekly by the America Press, New York.

President, RICHARD H. TIERNEY; Secretary, JOSEPH HUSSLEIN;
Treasurer, FRANCIS A. BREEN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS, POSTPAID:

United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$3.00

Canada, \$3.50 Europe, \$4.00

Address:

THE AMERICA PRESS, 59 East 83d Street, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW.

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

Editors' Residence, Campion House, 39 West 86th Street, New York City.

The Mother of the King

THE bodily assumption of Our Lady into heaven after her death is not yet a defined dogma of Catholic Faith, but in the opinion of such eminent theologians as Melchior Cano, Suarez and Benedict XIV, it is so solidly grounded on Catholic tradition that it would be rashness to deny it. The heart of the Faithful has certainly not led them astray. During the centuries which have elapsed since the day of Our Lady's death, they have ever believed that if the virginal body which conceived and gave birth to the God-man was submitted like His to the sway of death, like His too it never felt the corruption of the grave. By His own power He rose from the dead. By His power and through His love He united the pure soul of His Mother to her sinless body and, crowning in its beauty and majesty, the double prerogative of motherhood and virginity bade His Angels bear it above the choirs of the blessed, the serried ranks of the angelic host, to the very throne of the Deity, where it is exalted above every other creature in dignity and power.

It was a day of triumph such as the courts of Heaven alone can witness when the Rose of Sharon and the Lily of Israel, its bloom unwithered and its beauty unstained, was transplanted from the earth, unworthy to preserve its fragrance, to the bowers of Paradise. "Who is this King of glory?" asked the warders of the heavenly gates on the morning of Our Lord's Ascension. "Who is He that cometh from Edom . . . walking in the greatness of His strength?" When the Queen of Angels and of men, the Mother of God was borne aloft above the clouds of opal and of gold that made her footstool, "Who is she that cometh forth as the morning rising,

fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array!" they exclaimed, dazzled at her beauty. It is the Virgin foretold by Isaias, who hath conceived and brought forth the Babe of Bethlehem and the Redeemer of the World, the Woman of the Apocalypse whom St. John saw clothed with the sun, the Woman who has crushed the Serpent's head, the Judith whose maiden hands slew the enemy of her people and who exclaims to the watchmen on the heavenly battlements, "Open the gates, for God is with us, who hath shown His power in Israel." It is the Esther who now "traverses the mansions of Heaven, passing through all the doors, into the court of the King." And a throne is set for the Mother of the King, and she sits on His right hand.

The Feast of the Assumption is the crowning jewel in our Mother's diadem. In this mystery, as an old liturgy says, we see virginity bearing a son, and a death that had no peer. The passing away of our Queen was no less wonderful than her child-bearing had been joyful. If she excites our wonder because as a Virgin she brought forth a Son, she is perhaps still more wonderful in the way she goes to her God. She knew no corruption, no stain in life, she knew not of the degradation and the dissolution of the tomb. A supreme miracle of God's power in her Immaculate Conception, in the priceless gift of the Divine Maternity, the masterpiece of grace in her sinless life, she conquers the laws of nature in her death. She had surpassed all men in love, in faith, in purity, she is lifted above all created natures by the undivided splendors of her reward.

On her glorious feast-day, some faint echoes of her triumph reach our ears, some dim ray of her unclouded glory fills our souls. And our hearts are glad, and our lips are full of praise. For she is also our Mother and our Queen. Through her it is easy to go to God, for it was through her that He chose to come to us. He, and He alone is our Redeemer, she is our Mediatrix with Him. Through her shall we find favor with Him who loved her so tenderly, and who in the joyous mystery of the Assumption set the seal to the countless favors with which He had so lavishly crowned her.

Recreation for Our Soldiers

IT was a veteran educator who said that three things were necessary to keep a college boy straight. The first was the Sacraments, the second, prayer, and the third, a healthy interest in athletics. What the college boy requires, is good for all young people. We have long since found out that a list, carefully compiled, but consisting exclusively of "dout's" is a poor way of keeping them up to the mark. The boy *ought* never to have an idle moment. He should travel along a straight line from school to home, and there employ himself in study and other useful occupations. But he won't. Elizabeth Anne likewise, should recur, almost automatically, to her sampler and other household duties at the close

of the school day. But she won't either, even though she be the prefect, without blame and without reproach, of the junior sodality.

There is a good deal of the animal, the healthy growing animal in the young, that must be reckoned with. It is not bad. It is only natural. It cannot be suppressed, and the attempt at repression only leads to disaster. All work and no play, says the proverb, makes Jack a dull boy, and, when the burden of the work is lifted for a time, tends to make him a bad one. His play-energies must have some kind of an outlet. Too much repression forces them into unhealthful channels. It is only common sense to study these energies, to discover how they may be used to best advantage and made a positive help, rather than a hindrance or an indifferent factor, in the life of the young. No doubt, the "teaching of play" has been made ridiculous by extremists. In itself, however, it is only the recognition of a very valuable truth in psychology and morals.

We are now sending our "boys" by thousands into the training camps. In these grim schools of war, the regime will be sufficiently drastic; so drastic, in fact, as to lead to a revulsion in the times allowed for relaxation and amusement. Next to the direct spiritual ministry among our soldiers, it is hard to conceive a higher work than that now taken in hand by the Knights of Columbus, who propose to erect and supervise amusement-centers for the troops. Even the brief experience at the Mexican border was enough to prove the absolute need of ample facilities for recreation of a proper kind for the military posts. We are confronted, apparently, with the alternative, that if we do not put suitable relaxation within easy reach of our soldiers, many will be led away to practices which ultimately mean ruin of body and soul, and consequent uselessness as fighting units. Patriotism and religion alike call on every Catholic to cooperate with the Knights in this admirable work, to the extent of his ability.

The Wrong Way.

IF reports are true, Frank Little, the I. W. W. leader, was in many respects an undesirable citizen. Just keeping within the limits of a benign interpretation of the law, he did all that he could to make the prosecution of the war a failure. Last month he took a principal part in stirring up revolt in Arizona. A few weeks ago, he went to Montana, where he urged the miners to cripple the Government as far as they could, by striking. According him the sincerity of his convictions, it is still true that wherever he went a storm arose, a storm that swept away no undeniable abuse or palpable exercise of tyranny, but only engendered class hatred and rancor. So undesirable did he become, that early on the morning of August 1, certain men, hiding their cowardly faces under masks, called him to the door of his house, bound him, and forthwith hanged him from a neighboring telegraph pole. The man who had coun-

seled violence as a fit and proper means of righting wrongs, ended his life as a victim of violence.

No doubt there will be many to applaud the action of these murderers. They undertook to rid the community of what many good citizens must have considered an intolerable nuisance, and at this perilous time a source of danger not to be left unchecked. But it is wrong, all wrong. Law and order want no such aids. Violence only begets violence. In stress, too many of us not only lose our heads, which is pardonable, but our sense of ethical values as well. Two wrongs never make a right, and never can. To do evil that good may come of it, and all be well, is not only bad morality, but a philosophy bound in the end to make even the attainment of the good aimed at impossible. And the scandal is greater when officials, by adopting evil practices, put themselves on a level with the forces which today are lifting up unholy hands against the authority that comes from God. It is not long since that in New York, petty tyrants in the uniform of the army disgraced the cause of liberty for which the country is at war. Happily, a recurrence was made impossible by the prompt action of the authorities at Washington. But it will be long before the incident is forgotten.

Rationalism and Patriotism

PROFESSOR THOMAS C. HALL has been dismissed from Union Theological Seminary. For years he has been teaching rationalism at that institution. He was not dismissed for that. Indeed, Union is considered broad enough to tolerate a rationalistic teacher. Its theology suffers of course, but Union seems to have strange ideas about that very strange science called Protestant theology. Professor Hall was forced to resign from Union, after the United States Government found him implicated in a plot that aimed at the destruction of the Government which protected him and his pupils in Union Seminary. His was a very poor return for government protection. Still he was an up-to-date rationalist, whose Christianity was Christless, but modern and a bit fashionable.

Just about a year ago another product of Union, Bouck White, enlivened a Socialist meeting by burning the "Stars and Stripes." No one is so foolish as to say that the erratic preacher learned flag-burning at Union. He learned rationalism there surely, and the consistent rationalist is a law unto himself. What does the man who is a law unto himself care for the flag?

Only a few weeks ago at Paterson, N. J., the police authorities interrupted a speech that was being delivered by Norman M. Thomas of New York, who was denouncing conscription. This young man a few years ago was licensed to preach by the New York Presbytery, although at the time of his examination his answers were unsatisfactory from "an evangelical standpoint." The examination had nothing to do with loyalty to country, but a good deal to do with loyalty to Christ.

Old-fashioned Protestantism would have been shocked at the disloyalty to Christ contained in the answers of this bright seminarian of a modern Protestant seminary. But old-fashioned Protestantism is as rare as a horse car in New York, or a crowded pew in summer at Grace or Trinity.

Rationalism had convinced this young preacher that he was a law unto himself. He would preach a Christ of his own making. But a Christ of his own making never said all authority comes from on high and that loyalty to the law of the land is a conscientious duty. The Christ of the Gospels said that. So when conscription became law, this very splendid product of rationalism proceeded to decry it, for he was his own law. He was brilliantly logical but the police did not follow his logic, so they put a period to his speech. He disagreed with the police, as Alexander Berkman did. In fact, Alexander Berkman held the rationalist's principle that he was a law unto himself. Of course he did not call it rationalism but anarchy. The strange thing is that the root principle of both is the same. Bring God down to the human level till finally there is no God, and you have rationalism in the schools; and anarchy in the State. It is a simple process but it spells the end of patriotism. For true patriotism means loyalty to God and to the nation's law as to the voice of God, sounding in human tones.

The Hot Weather

HOT weather is by general consent a bore, a burden, a trouble. Now while no man can add a cubit to his stature by taking thought, any son of Adam can indefinitely thicken, widen, deepen and elongate his troubles by the simple process of thinking about them. Tiny they may be, no bigger than the smallest of all seeds, but if put under the hothouse glass of persistent reflection, they will quickly grow into a great tree, in the branches whereof all manner of annoyances from all parts of the universe will find an undisturbed refuge. Acquainted with this psychological truth, Mrs. Wiggs was wont to hide all her worries in the bottom of her heart, and "set on the lid and smile." Then they could not grow.

Yes, it is hot now, but think of the crisp October that impends, of the delightful blizzards that may rage about our heads next January, of the bracing chill that comes from the Atlantic with the winds of March and April! It is sure to snow, if we wait long enough. There was once a man, newly-imported from the interior, who used to worry whenever the tide went out. Unmindful of the governing moon, he seemed to entertain some doubt about the certainty of its return. But it always came back. If the weather were invariably hot or unalterably cold, incessantly dry or wet without end, we might have some reason to complain. Happily it is set in a cycle, and the turn is always at hand. "'Tis war-rum," says Dooley's Clancy, "but ye can't look f'r snow-storms this time iv' th' year. Annyway," he says, "me mind's taken aff th' heat be me

wurruk. Dorsey that had th' big cindher-pile—th' wan near th' fince—was sun-struck Fridah, an' I've been promoted to his job. 'Tis a most re-sponsible place," he says.

Perhaps it is a strain in August to imagine what it feels like in the seasons when sere leaves fill the paths, or snow-drifts sparkle in the moon. If so, try to think how much better off you are, even with the mercury menacing the century mark, than thousands who like Tim Clancy, "wurruk out in th' mills, tin hours a day, runnin' a wheelbarrow loaded with cindhers."

Work and Drudgery

IN an address at a meeting of mechanical engineers, a Western manufacturer pictured in colors somewhat dark, the growing disposition of the day to look upon all work as "mere drudgery." This disposition, said the man of business, often leads to ill-considered strikes, occasional sabotage, and other industrial diseases which by lowering the output seriously interfere with "efficiency." "Industry," he concludes, "must find a substitute for the valuable relationship of master and man, which passed away with the coming of greater industrial concentration."

Honest work usually becomes dull drudgery because the laborer is not interested either in what he is doing, or why he is doing it. Why he is not interested is another question. In some cases, the lack is undoubtedly traceable to a mistaken vocation. Many a briefless lawyer or struggling physician realizes too late that the simpler duties of the farm or the counting-house would be more in keeping with his mental equipment. More than one young man now engaged in occupations almost menial, bitterly regrets the youthful folly that spoiled his preparation for a place of wider usefulness and profit in life. Others, perhaps, today find honest work "mere drudgery," because they have been caught by the false philosophy that life's main purpose is to seek amusement.

Lost opportunities, mistaken vocations and a bad philosophy will account for some ranks of the army of discontented workers, but not for all. The man who toils hard and faithfully for a pittance that barely suffices to keep body and soul together, may easily be pardoned for considering his occupation "drudgery." Of course, he ought to urge his interest to the flaming-point, by remembering that a half loaf is better than no bread, and that the laborer's cap is a badge of honor. But a badge of honor, along with all time-honored apothegms, grades low in calories, and to live for any considerable period on half a loaf means only half a life.

Probably the best way at the manufacturer's disposal of taking the drudgery out of work, is to consider the feasibility of paying the worker a living wage. It is just possible that the thing might be made to pay, in the form of an increased "efficiency." Rest-rooms, gymnasiums, mutual benefit societies and other devices usually viewed out of all perspective, it is to be feared, by the "socially

minded," are excellent as far as they go, but they do not go far enough. They stop short of justice. It was on justice that the old "valuable relationship of master and men" was founded, and it can be revived only when "the greater industrial concentration" of today realizes that justice comes first, and frills second. The worker who sells a dollar's worth of labor for fifty cents in silver

and twenty-five cents in some unwanted gymnasium privilege, simply because an habitually manipulated market makes better terms impossible, has a fair excuse for regarding his honest, poet-praised work as very prosaic drudgery. It was no less an authority than Leo XIII who authorized terms far stronger, by saying that in this case the worker is the victim of fraud and injustice.

Literature

LONGFELLOW AND SOME MODERN CONSIDERATIONS

LONGFELLOW is an ancient bard. His verse has become a twilight of memory to this generation, if not an utter darkness. We have had a literary revolution and are still wandering amid the ruins. Even a lame prose, calling itself free verse, is making a claim to Parnassus. This, of course, is the fantastic excess of the movement, the frenzy of the disease. The delirium will pass, but it must not be taken, as some are prone to take it, for a transitional phase of development. It is a decadence, a lapse towards barbarism, the tom-tomism of a dissipated culture settled into a pernicious anemia.

But much of even contemporary normal verse shows a vast swing away from Longfellow's age. It runs to a psychological subjectivism, a self-analysis harping on plaintive chords, expressive of purely personal moods. This is not necessarily poetic heresy, though it does not bespeak poetic health; for poets throughout all ages have struck, to some extent, the subjective note and sung their own moods. But the trend of contemporary verse is to confine itself within the limits of self-analysis, forgetful that there is a vast universe beyond the four walls of introspection. Subjective singing is only of poetic value when it can translate its mood into a universal mood; when its note harmonizes with the chiming of the spheres. When a poet sings his own love, he must, at the same time, sing the love of all other men; when he weeps, all other men must weep with him. But when a poet weeps introspectively, by a process of self-analysis, he weeps alone.

As a concomitant, or rather a result, of this modern tendency to introspective limitation in poetry arises the notion that verse-forms are of little value; the individual mood is idiosyncratic, therefore the form of expression is either peculiar or indifferent, as the poet may elect. The excess of this conception runs to so-called free verse. Within the compass of conventional forms, it uses any form indifferently for any mood. It is as if any instrument should be forced to produce any tone-color in music. The fact is, verse-measures have their normal expression, and the true poet, whose mood is always attuned to objective values, never forces his theme to an alien form. Grief cannot trip to a pizzicato measure, nor joy pace gravely to an adagio movement. A poet may write a sonnet to his mistress' eyebrow, but his *tour de force* is an artifice, whose accomplishment evokes a tolerant smile rather than wins a sincere applause. The murmur of bees is not a roll of thunder; when the poet murmurs, let him not reverberate his mood through tonitruating brasses; when he thunders, let him not crepitate Jove's bolt in the silken throat of a violet.

The anarchy of free verse is but an extreme symptom of the wide departure in verse-making since Longfellow's time. But the spirit of modern conventional verse also marks the difference, if not as emphatically, at least as surely. To go back to Longfellow is not only to return to another age, but to another clime. He began writing nearly a hundred years ago; the educational influences and culture of his younger days were as simple and sober as ours are complex and garish. He came

of a Puritan stock after Puritanism had happily escaped the gelidity of its ice-age. The felicitous circumstances of his young manhood enabled him to pursue the bent of his genius to the full. Several years' sojourn in Europe, where he came into direct contact with and assimilated, with ever-increasing sympathy and ardor, the romance-literature of the old world, expanded and fertilized his imagination and rounded out his culture. No man in American literature so sympathetically wrought into his own genius the spirit of old-world romance. There is nothing typically American in his work, even in the poems which are American in theme. "Evangeline" and "Hiawatha" are not exceptions. Their subject and their coloring may be locally American, but their spirit and their imaginative texture are from the looms of the old world. Longfellow was steeped in the influence of romance-literature and his native genius responded to it as the cord to the bow. Why poetry in this country should be typically American to be worth the while is a puzzle to plague the wise. If it be typically American, and worth the while, good; but worth the while because typically American does not follow. It is like that other dreadful challenge: What new message has the poet to give the gaping public, or is he really original?

It is true that Longfellow would find small audience today. But the poetic judgment of the hour has no permanent measure; it has no objective criterion. His work has been called elementary, which is true, but not damaging; it is a criticism founded more than often in a psychic neurosis; the same objection might be brought against Homer. Poetry must be judged for what it is, and not for what it does not pretend to be. Longfellow's poetry is simple and lucid. He did not deal with problems, but with life. It is a poetry of grace and sentiment, in pellucid and flowing numbers, a placid stream wending its way through wooded upland and flowering meadow, not too deep to plumb, nor yet shallow enough to brawl.

He was not a poet of sublime reach; his head was not constantly striking the stars. He could not plunge into the abyss on outstretched vans, like Milton's Satan, through chaos and ancient night. He had no epic depth and breadth, no passionate intensity like a Keats or a Shelley, no splendor of phrase like Tennyson; he had not the fiery appeal of Whittier, the humor or the satire of Lowell, the grave and solemn dignity of Bryant. But he had grace, sympathy, simplicity, sincerity, nobility and a power of imaginative treatment, which secure him a notable place on the heights of Parnassus.

His genius was mainly reflective and placid, but at times he could shake himself free from his meditative mood and strike his pinions in a stirring and rapid beat, as in "His Skeleton in Armor":

And as to catch the gale
Round veered the flapping sail.
"Death" was the helmsman's hail,
"Death without quarter."
Mid-ships with iron keel
Struck we her ribs of steel;
Down her black hulk did reel
Through the black water.

In his narrative poems he excels, and none tell a tale in verse better than Longfellow. "Evangeline," a striking *tour de force* in English hexameter and "Hiawatha" in rhymeless trochaic dimeter, are notable examples. But it is in the "Tales of a Wayside Inn" that his genius manifests itself most characteristically. The level of flight is even and sustained. He is here the true minstrel whose harp is well-attuned to his theme. The tales are of a varied character, four of them colonial, some gleaned from the "Decameron," others from the "*Gesta Romanorum*," some from "The Chronicles of Charlemagne." Never did poet select a happier medium for his peculiar muse, and, of all his work, none better reveals the true quality of his poetic gift.

In the sonnet's scanty plot of ground, which is always a searching test of poetic quality, he achieves a deservedly high place. The group of six accompanying his translation of Dante's "Divine Comedy" are wrought with a noble beauty of diction and have caught something of the Dantean dignity and fire. The translation itself is a notable achievement, but like all translations, but dimly reflects the splendor of the original. For that matter any translation of a great poem fails in the spontaneity and the vital grace of the original. Beauty, sifted through the medium of an alien tongue, becomes a pale and ineffectual fire. It is like sunlight through an obscuring veil of clouds.

In his day Longfellow was the most popular poet in his tongue. The reason is not far to seek; his simplicity, his lucidity, the elemental character of his work, its tenderness and appeal to the domestic affections made him easy reading for the average man. Among the English middle-classes he disputed the palm of popularity with Tennyson. Not even in America was his vogue, in his own day, as great perhaps as in England.

In this generation his work, if offered for the first time, would find scant appreciation. We have become a crowd of sophisticated, erratic and erotic psychologists fluttering aimlessly in the intense inane. Simplicity and objectivity are rare qualities in contemporary poetry, and Longfellow's muse, if she were to enter upon the scene today, would be as out of place and as unheeded as modesty in a Broadway cabaret.

CONDÉ B. PALLEN.

REVIEWS

The Mythology of All Races. In Thirteen Volumes. LOUIS HERBERT GRAY, A.M., Ph.D., Editor. GEORGE FOOT MOORE, A.M., D.D., LL.D., Consulting Editor. Greek and Roman. By WILLIAM SHERWOOD FOX, A.M., Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Classics, Princeton University. Vol. I. Boston: Marshall Jones Company. \$6.00 a volume.

A comprehensive collection by competent and judicious scholars of all the myths of the various races and ages of man has long been eagerly looked for by the student of ethnology, art, literature and religion. The editors of the "Mythology of All Races" have felt the want and in the present work have endeavored to fill the gap. The series is therefore needed and timely. Its theme in itself is most interesting. Few subjects can have a greater appeal for the man who wishes to know the history of the thoughts and feelings of the races of long ago, of their notions of the Deity and of the forces and the manifestations of nature around them. Many of the tales and stories of ancient mythology are extremely beautiful and embody the noblest lessons, while some are coarse and repulsive. But underneath them all the student, if he reads their meaning aright, will find some faint glimmer of truth, the dim spark in most cases, of that early revelation made to man by the Creator, often distorted it may be, but easily recognizable, if studied without prejudice or passion.

In the preface of the work, the consulting editor, Mr. George Foot Moore, claims that the collection is made for its own sake,

with no theory to maintain or illustrate. Here an objective study of the facts of mythology will be welcome. Few subjects lend themselves more readily to idle speculation and unsound hypotheses than the topic which forms the subject of the present volumes. Exception might be made from the Catholic point of view to the definition of religion given in the editor's preface, for the "scientific explanation" which according to him is the third element in the definition of religion seems to exclude that vital element of faith without which in the Catholic system it is impossible to worship or please God. There is also apparent the assumption of the gradual evolution of man from lower stages to a more perfect condition. Catholic readers will therefore weigh carefully the principles and the underlying theories of the writers of these volumes.

The first volume is admirably done. The Greek and Roman myths are outlined and analyzed by Professor William Sherwood Fox, of Princeton. In an "Introduction" he tells us what a myth is, explains its origin, its sanction and persistence, enumerates its kinds, tells us the character of the Greek myth, and is thus led to discuss the nature of the Greek religion in general. The Greek myths are then studied in all their wondrous variety from the story of Ouranos down to those where the element of chance is more visible, such as those of the Moirai, Tyche and Nemesis. It is a wonderful and fascinating story, and the editor throws no little light, thanks to his scholarship and power of interpretation, on those old legends of the "Voyage of the Argo" and the "Labors of Hercules," so familiar to our childhood. He shows the same thorough scholarship in the discussion of the myths of ancient Italy. If the editors keep unwarranted theories out of their finely conceived work, they will make a distinct contribution to modern scholarship. They are evidently thoroughly at home with their difficult theme. But their task is a hard one and many pitfalls are lying in their way. Care, taste and due reverence for their readers mark their choice of the many illustrations which enhance the value of the work.

J. C. R.

The Living Present. By GERTRUDE ATHERTON. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co. \$1.50.

"Without the help of the women, France could not have remained in the field six months," is an assertion that Mrs. Atherton proves true in this volume. The first and more valuable part of the book is made up of sixteen papers which describe the relief-work the ladies of France are doing so successfully, and the second part of the volume is devoted to the author's reflections on "Feminism in Peace and War," which are of little value. She gives vivid pen-pictures of the fashionable ladies of her acquaintance who are in charge of the various organizations that care for the wounded, the poverty-stricken and the bereaved, and she tells how the war changed many a social butterfly into a heroine. Mrs. Atherton has lived so long and so intimately with the French that she can give the following just estimate of the national character:

Contrary to the prevailing estimate of the French—an estimate formed mainly from sensational novels and plays, or during brief visits to the shops and boulevards of Paris—the French are a stolid, stoical, practical race, abnormally acute, without illusions, and whose famous ebullience is all in the top stratum. There is even a certain melancholy at the root of their temperament, for, gay and pleasure loving as they are on the surface, they are a very ancient and a very wise people. Impatient and impulsive, they are capable of a patience and tenacity, a deep deliberation and caution, which, combined with an unparalleled mental alertness, brilliancy without recklessness, bravery without bravado, spiritual exaltation without sentimentality (which is merely perverted animalism), a curious sensitiveness of mind and body due to overbreeding, and a white flame of patriotism as steady and dazzling as an arc-light, has given them a glorious history, and makes them, by universal consent, preeminent among the warring nations today.

But the author does not seem to realize the great influence France's long centuries of Catholicism have had in forming the noble women of "The Living Present." Indeed, it is surprising how little she knows about the Church. For example, she volunteers the information that the Visitation nuns of Bourg "had taken the vow never to look upon the face of a man," but when their convent became a hospital the Pope kindly "granted the holy nuns a temporary dispensation from their vows." Why did Mr. Stokes's official reader allow the author to publish such an absurdity as that?

W. D.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

The ninth revised edition of William E. Addis and Thomas Arnold's well-known "Catholic Dictionary, containing some account of the Doctrine, Discipline, Rites, Ceremonies, Councils, and Religious Orders of the Catholic Church" (Herder, \$6.50), has recently appeared. The late Rev. T. B. Scannell, D.D., was the editor of the new edition of this valuable book, and he cites the three Catholic encyclopedias that have been published within the last few years, and gives references to other standard works of recent date. The "Catholic Dictionary's" 876 large double-columned pages are so full of accurate information that it is a reference book of great value. With this and the "Catholic Encyclopedia" at hand, no one need be ignorant of the Church's doctrine, history and practice.

Giusuè Borsi, a young lieutenant in the Italian army, was slain at Zagora, November 10, 1915, while gallantly leading an attack. Prior to resuming the practice of Catholicism in 1913, he had used his remarkable gifts to attack religion and morality, but after his "conversion" Borsi committed to paper the spiritual "Colloquies" he had with God in prayer, and some of them are translated and printed in the current *Catholic Mind*, under the title, "A Catholic Soldier's Diary." He reveals his soul just as it is and shows how God purified and enlightened it. The second paper in the number is Father Edward Hawks's account of how he made his parish school a social center for his flock, by starting catechism classes for public school children, providing entertainment and instruction for working boys and girls, and offering courses in domestic economy for wives and mothers. Most readers will doubtless agree that Father Hawks should have many imitators.

The late Donald Hankey's "A Student in Arms," an interesting war book favorably noticed in our issue of March 17, 1917, was so widely read that a "Second Series" (Dutton, \$1.50) of fifteen papers quite varied in character has been published, but as often happens in like cases, the volume's quality is not equal to that of its predecessor. The best essays in the book are "The Bad Side of Military Service," "The Good Side of Militarism," "The Fear of Death in War," and a "Letter to an Army Chaplain." What the author says about immorality in the British army should cause those in authority, it would seem, considerable concern. The autobiographical parts of the book are quite interesting, but the "Imaginary Conversations" fall rather flat.

The six best sellers for June have already been noticed in AMERICA. They are: "Mr. Britling Sees It Through," "The Light in the Clearing," "The Definite Object," "His Family," "The Hundredth Chance," and "The Road to Understanding."—It is a pity that Mr. William J. Locke, in his latest novel, "The Red Planet" (Lane, \$1.50), which will also be a best-seller, no doubt, has essayed to work out a philosophical theory. His subject, the same as that treated by Mgr. Benson in the "Coward," is the demoralizing effect wrought on otherwise noble characters by sudden paroxysms of paralyzing fear. By such seizures Mr. Locke's hero is betrayed into depths of shame.

The author tries to reconcile widely discordant elements in the main person in his story, and in spite of his degradation to win for him a large measure of sympathy. The story is not a pleasant one, the optimism of the old soldier who tells the tale is somewhat misplaced, the gloom of the war pervades every page, and although there are several delightful minor characters, the shadow of Leonard Bryce's failings is over them all. The book is clever, and well-written, but the author should have done with baffling psychological analysis and go back to the subjects in which he is more at home. One "Beloved Vagabond" is worth a dozen Leonard Bryces. What the public wants from the pen of Mr. Locke is his sympathetic delineation of simple, unobtrusive kindness, all the better for its admixture of whimsicality.—"Fairhope, the Annals of a Country Church" (Macmillan, \$1.25), by Edgar Dewitt Jones, is a delightful record of a Protestant community in northern Kentucky. The literary value of these memoirs, their mellowness and delicacy, compensates for lack of interest in the subject-matter. The characters are as real as they are accurately described, while the incidents are introduced with the grace of an experienced story-teller.

The "first series" of "Sermon Notes" (Longmans, \$1.25), by the late Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson is made up of the discourses he preached while an Anglican. They are divided into nine groups which correspond more or less with the divisions of the Church's year. Often the notes are so full that the Bensonian touch is quite visible. The sermons are moral rather than doctrinal and so orthodox on the whole that Father Martindale, who edits the volume, seldom has to supply corrective footnotes. Preachers will of course be interested in the volume, and as the editor suggests, Mgr. Benson's admirers can use it profitably as a meditation book. The "second series" will contain his Catholic sermon notes.

SOCIOLOGY

Jane Ashton's Teeth

THIS is really a collection of hot-weather thoughts on why it is necessary for civilized communities to have laws. In another form, the underlying ideas were once expressed at a New York State Conference of Charities and Corrections; as a result, the *New York Call* remarked, with a deal of unnecessary ferocity, that the expresser was "a perfect type of the solid bone-head." But to return to Jane Ashton's teeth.

Jane, relates the *Kansas City Star*, loathes the attentions of the dentist. Despite her family, she will wait until driven by toothache before having her teeth cared for, and in the interim her complaints of the pain she suffers are loud and long. Some days ago her mother was urging her not to wait for the catastrophe, but to go before her teeth gave her trouble. "But, mother," Jane protested, "they are my own teeth, aren't they? If I want to let them ache, isn't that my privilege?"

"No, they are not your own teeth," replied mother. "They are the family's teeth, and the family suffers from them when you let them get to aching."

"That principle," comments the *Star* wisely, "applies to most of our interests. They aren't ours alone. They are the family's, the town's, the nation's. We can't paddle our individual boat. We are on a raft with a lot of others, and what we do concerns them as well as us." No man lives to himself, as the Grammar teaches.

PROPENSITY TO EVIL

THAT is to say, we live in a community, a society exercising lawful authority, competent to forbid us to sink the raft, or to let our teeth ache to the annoyance of others. Man is not an isolated atom, but a social being. No man is sufficient to himself either for his temporal needs or for the higher neces-

sities of his mind and soul. In the union of a common bond, forged by common needs and common aspirations, he finds himself best able to work toward self-preservation and the attainment of happiness. He must therefore, by the constraint of nature, be a citizen of some State, perfect or inchoate; and the natural reason why he must obey is because "the humanity that is in him" makes his proper development impossible, unless he takes his place as a subject of that helpful union of allied interests, deriving its authority from God, which we call the State.

It would be easy to sketch an ideal State wherein every human factor would labor not only at his own happiness and perfection, but for the happiness and perfection of his neighbor and of the community. History, however, teaches that this ideal State has never existed; experience, that it does not exist today. There was never a society, even were it a partnership or a family, utterly free from clashing interests; and, morally speaking, the State in which no citizen will ever be inclined to enforce his own claims, without regard to the claims of others, seems impossible. "If there is anything absolutely certain," writes the English philosopher, Lilly, "it is that there is innate in every human being a propensity which renders him prone to evil and averse to good."

WHY LAW IS NEEDED

WHAT can the State do to lessen this propensity? The means at its disposal are many and varied. It can encourage religion and education, with their elevating and purifying influences. It can appeal to the individual's realization of the necessity of organized society, and of his obligation to do his part in maintaining society as an efficient instrument of the public good. It can remind him, in season and out, that vice is hideous and virtue desirable, while thrift, peace, and honesty are profitable to the individual, and, at least indirectly, to every member of the community. But what if all these means, patiently and perseveringly applied, fail? What if, in a given case, they have failed? Is the criminal propensity of the law-breaker to be allowed precedence over the virtuous principles of the major part of the community?

Against this unchecked propensity, deaf to reason, law launches its sanction. "Men," wrote Plato, "must necessarily frame laws if they are not to sink to the level of the most savage beast." ("Laws," IX.) And he adduces the reason:

If ever by some Divine dispensation there were born a man with a nature capable of these attainments [perfect political wisdom and self-control] he would stand in need of no laws to rule him . . . but, as things are, such a mind is nowhere found, except some faint traces; therefore, as a second-best course, we must take to law and order. Aristotle adds the "coercive sanction":

But these [motives drawn from reason] seem to have no power to dispose the bulk of mankind to goodness. . . . The bulk of mankind pursue the pleasures they like, and the means thereunto, and shun the contrary pains. . . . The man who lives by passion will not listen to the voice of reason, nor can he understand it. And when this is a man's state, how can any arguments effect a change in him? It would seem, indeed, as if passion were deaf to argument, and yielded to force only. . . . Therefore, law, although it is the reasoned conclusion of abstract wisdom and intelligence, has a coercive sanction. ("Nichomachean Ethics," x, 9.)

Centuries later, St. Thomas discussed the same truth in these words:

Because of wanton and saucy spirits prone to vice, who cannot easily be moved by words, it was found necessary to provide means of restraining them from evil by force and fear; that so, at least, they might desist from evil-doing, allow others to live in quiet, and themselves at length be brought by habituation of this sort to do willingly what formerly they accomplished out of fear, and thus might become virtuous. ("Summa," I-II, Q. xcv., art. II.)

These passages give in outline the commonly accepted view of the sanction of law.

CRIME AND RESPONSIBILITY

BRIEFLY, it is this: Man violates an authoritative prescription, thereby causing a breach in the moral order. Society imposes a penalty. It intends, thereby, to repair the breach, or, as some put it, to vindicate the outraged majesty of the law by dissolving the *vinculum juris*, the fetter forged upon the law by crime. Its next intention is to deter the criminal and others from repeating the offense. In the third place, it proposes to reform the offender by this discipline, or, as St. Thomas says, to bring him to do willingly what once he did through fear. Ultimately, the whole process works for the good of the individual and of the community.

Today our ideas on the sanction of law are undergoing an unsatisfactory change. Crime, we are told, is a disease, like typhoid or measles; it involves, therefore, neither actual guilt nor personal responsibility. Everybody is at fault except the alleged criminal. He, poor man, is an invalid demanding the most delicate consideration; he is lured, hypnotized, brainstormed; or his grandfather, moldering in some forgotten churchyard, was a notorious character. No one denies the actuality of borderline cases, or the influence, as yet unmeasured, of heredity, and especially of environment. The teaching that certain malign conditions, external or personal to the individual, may lessen or destroy responsibility is no discovery of a new jurisprudence, but a principle as old as historical man. But crime is caused by the free act of the individual; else the act is not crime, but accident, or the result of mental aberration. It seems, therefore, high time to call a halt upon our newer theories, and, as a first measure of prevention and reform, to insist on personal responsibility and respect for legitimate authority. We are not going to do away with evil by building gymnasiums or cooking schools, and then sitting down to rest. The ability to chin one's self six times or to make drip coffee does not take away the temptation to crime. If we are to make progress towards ideals of right living, we need discipline, mental discipline, and, above all else, that moral discipline which will teach our boys and girls to "love the brotherhood, fear God and honor the King."

LIBERTY AND OBEDIENCE

WE need not plead for fear of punishment as the ultimate motive of prevention or reform, but we cannot safely blind ourselves to the fact that this fear has its place and value in the life of the community. As a modern investigator, Dr. William Healy writes in his study, "The Individual Delinquent."

With full appreciation of the offender's personal background, and with attempt at all needed therapy, there may well go hand in hand the deliberate idea of building up inhibitory powers by maintaining the concept of possible future penalty. Even in cases of short periodic relaxation of will-power, there is no reason why the idea of retribution should not be invoked to aid in moral reformation, though the conduct has a definite physical basis which demands consideration.

Obedience to the law is a lesson that must be learned. Without subjection there can be no freedom; without law no liberty. It is a lesson that must be instilled in the home, in the school, by the churches, by all mediums of public communications, and by our courts. If this lesson can be taught by building up the character on lines of gentleness and love, let us work along this more excellent way. But if these means fail with Izzy the gunman and Tony the thug, let us not hesitate to adopt what Plato called "the second-best course," the unflinching sword of the law.

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

EDUCATION

A Little Knowledge

THE question is sometimes asked: "Why are there so few Catholic educators in secular institutions of learning?" The answer is not difficult. Proportionately, the total number of Catholic students in various institutions of learning, including colleges, universities, normal schools and seminaries, is rather higher than that of any other denomination. But the teaching force of the Catholic schools needs constant recruiting; a fair percentage of men enter the seminaries to study for the priesthood, while the others engage in other professions, especially law and medicine.

Graduation in the law school takes place a year in advance of the regular graduations, and the conditions among law students are much like those of the general undergraduate body. There remain the students preparing for the other degrees, especially in medicine, and in the sciences and the humanities.

THE "DABBING" PHYSICIAN

AS regards physicians, they are dabblers in the sciences. Their profession requires that they "dabble" in botany, chemistry, physics, zoology, pharmacy, physiology, anatomy, in the languages, perhaps in law, and in a host of related studies. The training of the present-day medical student may be likened to the passage of a man down an aisle in a store, who sees on both sides of him well-filled baskets of fruits and produce, from each of which he has time to select only a sample. "Sampling" is the word that best describes the training of the medical student. Yet in collecting the samples, the medical student generally is impressed only with the number of samples obtained, and forgets entirely the size of the baskets from which they were taken. A dear old physician used to say to me: "Physicians are the most conceited men in the world. I am one. Because they have touched so many sciences they have an exaggerated idea of their knowledge, their influence and their responsibilities, and regard the sciences and professions with a patronizing air." Be that as it may, there can be no doubt that the medical student is excessively conscious of his learning and extraordinarily imbued with his own importance. Self-conceit and the frank materialism that pervades the atmosphere of most medical schools, induce him to slight his religious obligations, and defection from the Faith seems to be the usual outcome.

Of medical students, one of every seven, an average derived from several schools, is a Catholic; yet I doubt if one of seven Catholics will remain true to his religion. Of physicians known to me personally, one of every six is a baptized Catholic, yet perhaps only one of ten such Catholics still adheres to the Faith in which he was baptized.

GRADUATE STUDENTS AND FACULTY

A PART from medicine, the defection among postgraduate students is considerable. In one group of twelve graduate students, three were Catholics, three Methodists, one an atheist, another a Jew and four were of miscellaneous faiths. Of these, one Catholic, two Methodists and three of miscellaneous creeds practised their faith. One of the lapsed Catholics, had no religious training in childhood, the other had, he said, a too rigid training, and hence a reaction set in when he left home for high school. Parenthetically, I note that both married non-Catholics. The Methodist stated he had left his denomination because of the disagreement of his church with science. The defections will probably increase after a few years. This was in a science group, but defection is no less marked in the humanities, I believe.

Finally, the faculty. To educators, no modern movement is of such intense interest as the movement toward unification of creeds. It means the virtual abrogation of the doctrine of "private judgment," while the practical Christianity, so strongly in-

sisted upon by this same movement, is in effect a repudiation of the doctrine of "justification by faith." Thus the old differences are wiped out, and a position is assumed which accords in many respects with the stand of the Catholic Church. Educators recognize this swinging toward the Church; they are aware also of her unchanged, dignified stand. This recognition is best illustrated when controversial topics are under discussion. "I wonder what the Catholics say to this?" is the question asked. They do not seem to concern themselves with the opinions of other denominations; subconsciously, they all accord the Catholic Church the position of precedence, and hence of authority.

SCIENTISTS AND RELIGION

THE present attitude of scientists leans toward conciliation. "If I belonged to any church at all, it would be the Catholic Church," is a statement made to me so frequently by scientists during the past ten years that it compels attention. The reason, too, was given. "I admire the splendid organization of the church, and the education of her priests. The clergy is composed of educated men, backed by the authority of the church; they are not subservient to the whims of their parishioners. They are not 'merely high school 'grads,' with half a year at a seminary (I quote actual words), but university-trained men who know what they are talking about." Once more the old adage holds true, "Knowledge begets respect." One may also add, "tolerance."

These were well-known teachers, men of influence, of much experience, and considerable achievement. In contrast to their liberal view stands the intolerance of slight knowledge. A little knowledge is indeed a dangerous thing. It is a strange human trait that incites a man to fulminate against something of which he knows little, or nothing at all. Such is the case with many educated men who pretend to sneer at Christianity, yet some of the sneerers very patently have read not even a chapter of the Gospels they ridicule.

Like the rest of humanity, educators have their fads, in their teaching, in their research, and in their creed. Until a few years ago it was fashionable, especially in the sciences, to be a serious freethinker, and perhaps to own a "Freethinker's Catechism"—this last a paradox in itself. I venture to say that this external profession was largely a pose, and that secretly many of the "freethinkers" believed in a personal God and a hereafter. Yet many practised better than they preached. How else can one explain the anomaly of the professor who preached a destructive agnosticism in the classroom, and yet was a deacon in his church?

THE PASSING MATERIALISM

THE pendulum has swung in the other direction: scientists are again seen in the churches. With splendid impartiality many attend a different church each time they go. But this swinging has a deeper significance than mere "faddism." It marks the revival of a Christian idealism and the incipient decline of an intolerant materialism. Even before the great war, condemnation of the criteria of materialism was heard with increased frequency. The warped perspective of a too rigid professionalism, the falseness of personal gain as a criterion of justice, and the material ideal of success were deprecated and denounced. The system whose first tenet is a denial of God, and whose second is selfishness, was stigmatized as impossible; it had had its opportunity, and the results were not pretty to contemplate. In introducing the element of sacrifice, educators have strayed far indeed from the materialistic creed of selfishness. For the Christian ideal is sacrifice, embodied in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ for man, and in the sacrifice of the individual for his family, for his fellow-man and for his country. In this return to a Christian ideal lies the best promise for the future.

University of Missouri. RICHARD A. MUTTKOWSKI, Ph.D.

NOTE AND COMMENT

The Red Cross and Florence Nightingale

THE founder of the Red Cross, Henry Dunant, speaking at a meeting of the National Association for the promotion of Social Science in London, in 1872, said:

To Miss Florence Nightingale I give all the honor of this humane convention. It was her work in the Crimea that inspired me to go to Italy during the war of 1859. In my turn I endeavored to follow the example of Miss Nightingale, as she herself had followed in the steps of Him who went about doing good.

It is well to recall Florence Nightingale's ideal in these days when much is spoken about the cause of suffering humanity. In suffering humanity Florence Nightingale saw the blood-red image of the Great Sufferer.

Saint Anne de Beaupré

THE feast of Saint Anne de Beaupré was celebrated this year at her national shrine with extraordinary splendor and devotion. According to the correspondent of the *Soleil* of Quebec, who wrote from Beaupré on July 26, the day of the feast a throng of 12,000 pilgrims came to the little village on the St. Lawrence not only from the Province of Quebec, but from every Province in Canada and from far-away districts in the United States. The spectacle at the Pontifical Mass at which his Eminence, Cardinal Bégin, of Quebec, assisted, was deeply impressive. Almost every year, some extraordinary favor marks the solemnity, and well-authenticated cures attest the power of the mother of Our Lady. This year, five such instances, as yet however not officially confirmed, have been reported. Among them the most striking perhaps is the cure of a Syrian girl. The Church is proverbially slow to pronounce officially upon these facts, but there can scarcely be any doubt that the little Canadian village has been the scene of well-certified and extraordinary cures, which science can explain in no ordinary and natural way and which can be ascribed only to the power of God who in working them does honor to the mother of Our Lady and rewards the faith of her clients. The spiritual favors and graces conferred through St. Anne on thousands who visit her shrine cannot be reckoned. No one leaves Beaupré without having his faith enkindled and his devotion and piety deeply stirred.

Birth-Rate and Birth-Control

RACE-suicide, whose propaganda has not ceased during the war, may be given pause by the set of figures published in the London *Month* for July, 1917. A comparison is instituted by the English magazine between France and England:

- In 1700, France numbered about 20,000,000 inhabitants.
- The British Isles numbered from 8,000,000 to 10,000,000.
- In 1789, France numbered about 26,000,000.
- The British Isles numbered about 12,000,000.
- In 1814, France numbered about 29,500,000.
- The British Isles numbered about 19,000,000.
- In 1880, France numbered about 37,200,000.
- The British Isles numbered about 34,800,000.
- In 1913, France numbered about 39,500,000.
- The British Isles numbered about 46,000,000.

In these last two periods the decay of Christian morality had its effect in both countries, but to a far greater extent in France, especially when we consider how the population of Ireland steadily decreased owing, not to race-suicide; but to the causes and consequences of the famine, from over 8,000,000 in 1841 to less than 4,500,000 in 1914. In 1881 France had about 10,000,000 more inhabitants than Italy but 144,000 less births. In 1910 France was only 3,000,000 ahead of Italy and yet fell short of the latter's number of births by 370,000. Many indications show that the main cause of this terrible decay is voluntary sterility. The number of marriages is increasing (282,000 in 1881; 308,000 in

1911; a greater percentage than in Germany). There is no trace of organic incapacity. Few unions prove entirely sterile, and one authority places the number of abortive births at 500,000 a year. Voluntary sterility is proved by the fact that the 282,000 marriages in 1881 produced 937,000 births, whilst the 308,000 marriages in 1911 produced only 740,000. In 100 French families 16 have no children; 50 have one or two; 23 have three or four; 8 have five or six, and only 3 over seven! The average family is 2.7 in France, 3.7 in England, 4.2 in Germany, 4.5 in Italy, 4.7 in Russia.

Four organizations have been formed in France, to counteract by every means fiscal, political, and moral, this curse of race-suicide that has been destroying the French nation more surely than any Prussian advance. It is worth noting that wherever the population, as in Brittany, is made up of practical Catholics their families are large. The Church's stand is clear. She recognizes the necessity of prudence on the part of parents and a sane regard for each other's health. Continence is the one restrictive measure.

Evangelizing South America

THE *American Israelite* contains a good paragraph about the propaganda against Latin Americans that is popular in some sections of our country:

If love of truth did not count with us, which we are far from insinuating, ordinary Yankee business shrewdness ought to induce us to discourage the bigoted propaganda against Latin-Americans and the Catholic faith which they profess. For the rest, the shameful tactics to which some of the sects resort in their attempt to "evangelize" South America, are a sad commentary on the spirit of Christian charity, which is supposed to be the actuating motive. There are plenty of pagans in the world to be converted to Christianity, and efforts in the latter direction would be a more creditable performance than the attempt to alienate South Americans from their Catholic faith by having recourse to slander and misrepresentation.

Indeed, there are a number of pagans in the United States awaiting the zealous ministry of those who are so concerned about South Americans. The problem of empty pews in non-Catholic churches might be solved before an attempt is made to carry the torch of enlightenment to the people south of the Canal zone.

The War Fund's Progress

ENCOURAGING reports have been issued by the official organ of the Knights of Columbus, the *Columbiad*, concerning the progress of the million dollar drive undertaken by the Knights:

The drive for the Knights of Columbus \$1,000,000 War Fund is meeting with cordial cooperation from Catholics throughout the country, and all indications are that the fund will be readily acquired. In fact, so spontaneous has been the response to the appeal issued by the Supreme Officers of the Order that there is every reason to believe that the initial fund of \$1,000,000 will be augmented far in excess of that amount.

The K. of C. War Committee has already closed contracts for \$100,000 worth of buildings for recreation centers and chaplains' quarters at the army cantonments, and negotiations are under way for the awarding of contracts for an additional \$100,000 worth of buildings. The more the work advances the more do those in charge realize its huge dimensions. Already chaplains have been attached, at the Order's expense, to various camps, and more are being appointed.

How vitally necessary is moral protection for the morale of an army in camp or in the field is patent to all interested in the welfare of soldiers. Efficient chaplain service secures this protection, and the Knights' War Fund campaign was launched for this purpose. As the Supreme Knight has stated: "The time for talk has passed, the time for action has arrived. It is a call for 'All aboard' and every one must do his part."